Thomas Farley, B.D.
Rect. of Ducklington
Oxon
1841

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

FRIENDS OF
DUKE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
Frank Baker

1. Brits Independ.ce of Church upon y.e State

2 Brits Div: Right of Episcopacy

2 Workmen wanted

# Th
# INDEPEND
OF THE
# CHUR.
UPON THE
# STAT
As to its Pure
# *Spiritual Powe*
Proved from
The HOLY SCRIPTURES, and
*Writings* of the *Primitive Fathers*.

With ANSWERS to the most Material OBJECTIONS.

By *THOMAS BRETT*, LL. D.

*As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.* S. John xx. 21.

Edw.d *LONDON*: Peck

Printed for HENRY CLEMENTS, at the *Half-Moon* in S. *Paul's-Church-yard*. 1717.

1.6

## ERRATA.


...in, *Line* 2. *for* Gal. vii. *read* Gal. vi. *Pag.* 3. *Lin.* 30. *read* Word. *Pag.* 12. *Lin.* 14. *after* Christ *put a Colon. Lin.* 1. *for* Rom. xiii. *read* Rom. xii. *Pag.* 27. *Lin.* 1. *Pag.* 28. *Lin.* 29. *after* did, *add* not. *Pag.* 31. *Lin.* 26. *Pag.* 34. *Lin.* 7. *for* it, *read* they. *Pag.* 37. *Lin.* 23. *for* . *Pag.* 40. *Lin.* 25. *read* together. *Pag.* 48. *Lin.* 9. *read Ibid. Lin.* 32. *for* nominate, *read* nominates. *Pag.* 51. *Marg.* ...ccount of Church-Government. *Pag.* 60. *Lin.* 22. *for* deli- delegated. *Pag.* 62. *Lin.* 5. *after* it *put a Colon. Pag.* 64. ...r Office *put a Comma. Ibid. Lin. ult. for* to, *read* or. *Pag.* 65. ...after Men *put a Comma. Ibid. Lin.* 30. *for* may, *read* might. *Marg. for* Cor. xiv. *read* Cor. iv. *Pag.* 75. *Lin.* 4. *for* juſt, ...t. *Ibid. Marg. for* Chron. xxviii. *read* Chron. xxvii. *Pag.* 77. ...le that. *Pag.* 92. *Lin.* 11. *for* thy, *read* they. *Pag.* 102. *Lin.* 9. *re...* ...separation. *Pag.* 104. *Lin.* 9. *dele* the. *Pag.* 110. *Lin.* 6. *for* per- ſwaded, *read* perſuaded. *Pag.* 111. *Lin.* 17. *after* Perſon *put a Note of Interrogation. Ibid. Lin.* 18. *after* Fault *put a full Stop.*

E
RBR
B845I

# THE CONTENTS.

## INTRODUCTION.

§ I. *IT is unjust to charge Primitive Doctrines as Popish, and gives the Papists great Advantages against us.* Page i

§ II. *Therefore, to inform our Flocks what are the Doctrines of the Primitive Church, is the best Method to preserve them from Popery.* v

§ III. *The present and some following Treatises design'd for this Purpose* vi

§ IV. *The Matters here proposed to be treated of, are the same Primitive Doctrines which I defended in my Vindication of myself from the Charge of Popery, with the Addition of two other Points,* viz. Mixing Water with the Wine in the *Holy Eucharist.* *And* the Practice of *Chrism* in Confirmation. *With a Declaration of my Desire, that we should restore all the Universal Customs of the Church as they were at the Time of the Council of* Nice. vii

§ V. *This the best Method to introduce Catholick Unity in the Church.* viii

## The Independency of the Church upon the State, as to its pure Spiritual Powers.

§ I. *WHAT are the Spiritual Powers of the Church, as set down in Holy Scripture.* Pag. 1

§ II. *Objection concerning Kings being Nursing Fathers of the Church, consider'd.* 3
§ III. *The Pope's Encroachments on the State the Occasion of setting up the Regale to such an Height in the Reign of King* Henry VIII. 4
§ IV. *A Query put at that Time concerning the Regal Authority in Spiritual Affairs. And how it was then differently answered.* 5
§ V. *Another Query at the same time, and to the same Purpose, with the Answers then given.* 6
§ VI. *This is the Beginning of those Principles now called* Erastian. 8
§ VII. *Christ the Head of the Church; therefore all Spiritual Power must be derived from him.* 9
§ VIII. *Christ committed no Part of this Power to the Magistrate, but to his Apostles and their Successors.* 10
§ IX. *This Power not imply'd in the Civil Magistrate's Supremacy.* 12
§ X. Supreme Head of the Church, *a new Title never assum'd by any Prince before King* Hen. VIII. 14
§ XI. *What Power he assum'd by vertue of this Title.* 16
§ XII. *He seem'd to think Bishops but his Deputies, even in Spiritual Matters, but was not fully satisfy'd in that Point.* 17
§ XIII. *And never durst take upon him to consecrate a Bishop.* 18
§ XIV. *This Title only given to him and his Son, King* Edward VI. *and repealed by Parliament in the next Reign, nor ever after restored.* 19
§ XV. *Strange therefore that any, especially Clergy-men, should now give our Kings this Title.* 20
§ XVI. *Kings have, however, a Civil Authority over Spiritual Persons.* 21
§ XVII. *And in Civil Sanctions annex'd to Spiritual Causes.* 23
§ XVIII. *This the Right of all Princes, whether Heathen or Christian.* 28
§ XIX. *Appeals from the Archbishop to the King, abused in this Realm, consider'd.* 29
§ XX. *The Independency of the Church, as to pure Spiritual Matters, asserted by the Homilies.* 31
§ XXI. *And also in an Act of Parliament.* 34
§ XXII. *How the Spiritual and Temporal Governor may, and in some Cases must, both judge the same Person, and in relation*

*lation to the same Cause, and yet neither interfere with the other.* 36

§ XXIII. *The Civil Magistrate cannot give or take away a Spiritual Office.* 40

§ XXIV. *The Kings naming or recommending a Person to be consecrated a Bishop, does not give such an one the Episcopal Commission.* 43

§ XXV. *And our Bishops, though so nominated by the King, yet receive their Spiritual Authority from Senior Bishops, and so have the same Power which the Apostles and Primitive Bishops had.* 45

§ XXVI. *Therefore, as the Civil Magistrate does not give this Power, so neither can he take it away.* 47

§ XXVII. *The Bishop has no Spiritual Superior in his own Line or District, as is proved from Scripture.* 51

§ XXVIII. *This Superiour Authority of the Bishop necessary to preserve the Unity of the Body of Christ.* 55

§ XXIX. *And unless this Unity be preserv'd, all Gifts and Graces are nothing worth, as S.* Paul *teaches.* 57

§ XXX. *For, the Breach of this Unity makes a Schism, and destroys the Band of Charity: And the People had no Power to depose their Bishop, or put another in his Place.* 59

§ XXXI. *Neither had the Civil Magistrate any such Power.* Ib.

§ XXXII. *Neither did the Bishop's Non-Residence, or Necessary Absence, deprive him of his Authority over his Flock.* 60

§ XXXIII. *Nor the Civil Magistrate's Prohibition.* 61

§ XXXIV. *The Intruders into another Bishop's District were Schismaticks, though supported by the Civil Magistrate.* 62

§ XXXV. *All this prov'd from S.* Paul's *Doctrine.* 64

§ XXXVI. *Dr.* Hody's *Notion about Deprivations by* Irresistible Force, *contrary to S.* Paul's *Doctrine.* 65

§ XXXVII. *His Misrepresentation of the* Novatian *and* Donatist *Schisms.* 68

§ XXXVIII. *An Account of the* Novatian *Schism from S.* Cyprian *and others living at that Time.* Ibid.

§ XXXIX. *An Account of the* Donatist *Schism from Contemporary Authors.* 72

§ XL. *No* Irresistible Force *can be used to depose a Bishop.* 74

§ XLI. *The Case of* Abiathar *said to have been depos'd by* Solomon. 75

§ XLII. *That Case consider'd.* 76

§ XLIII. *An Answer to several Queries.* 1. *Whether Christ*

*pointed, or his Apoſtles, leſt any Rule in the ſacred Writings for the Depoſing a Biſhop?* 79

§ XLIV. 2. *Whether the Judging and Depoſing a Biſhop by Provincial Synods, was not in the Beginning a mere Prudential, and no Divine, Inſtitution?* 80

§ XLV. 3. *Whether it was not a mere Favour of the firſt Chriſtian Emperors to yield the Cauſes of Biſhops as formerly to Synods?* 83

§ XLVI. 4. *Did not the firſt Chriſtian Emperors, when they ſaw Reaſon, interpoſe in the Cauſes of Biſhops, and determine them in another Way from the firſt Provincial Plan?* 84

§ XLVII. 5. *Did not the Emperor* Gratian *order, by his Civil Authority, that* Damaſus, *Biſhop of* Rome, *and any five or ſeven Biſhops with him, ſhould be ſufficient to depoſe Biſhops?* 86

§ XLVIII. 6. *Was the Church of* England *Schiſmatick under Queen* Elizabeth, *when ſhe, in Parliament, deprived ſeveral Biſhops?* 89

§ XLIX. 7. *If Schiſm renders the Adminiſtration of all Miniſterial Offices ineffectual; and if the Pretenſions of more than one to a See, makes a Schiſm, what ſhall be ſaid for the Orders of the* Engliſh, *and indeed of the whole* Weſtern *Church?* 94

§ L. 8. *There was a Schiſm kept up in the* Weſtern *Church 70 Years. Were the People all this Time, and ſince, deprived of all Benefit of Divine Ordinances?* 106

§ LI. LII. *A general Recapitulation of what has been proved.* 114, to 122

§ LIII. *The Clergy are not proud and ambitious for maintaining this Independency of the Church; but when they do not do it, are unfaithful to their Truſt.* 122

THE

# THE INTRODUCTION.

§ I. SOME Time ſince, I wrote a *Vindication* of myſelf from the Charge of Popery, caſt upon me very unjuſtly by ſome of the News-Writers; and tho' I ſee no Occaſion to add any thing more in my own Vindication againſt that groundleſs Aſperſion, having there ſo fully renounced every Article of the *Romiſh* Creed, and ſufficiently declar'd my juſt Abhorrence of the many Corruptions in that Church; and tho' I do not know that any one has ſince pretended to renew that falſe Calumny againſt me, yet I think it may be proper to ſay ſomething more with regard to the Doctrines I have there alſo vindicated: Which being ancient Doctrines of the Church, and to which the Practice of the truly Primitive, Catholick and Apoſtolick Church was conform and agreeable, cannot be too frequently inculcated into the Minds of the People, in order to reſtore the like Practice in the preſent Age. And thoſe who have oppoſed theſe Doctrines as *Popiſh* or

*favouring of Popery*, according to the Modern Phraſe, do not conſider what Service they do to *Popery* by ſuch Suggeſtions: For if the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church be *Popery*, then is *Popery* the true Religion; becauſe, (*a*) as *Tertullian* ſays, *That is Truth which is firſt; That is falſe which is after.* (*b*) *That is the Truer which is former; that is the former which is from the Beginning; that is from the Beginning which is from the Apoſtles.* Agreeable to that of the Prophet, (*c*) *Thus ſaith the Lord, Stand ye in the Ways, and ſee, and ask for the OLD Paths, where is the good Way, and walk therein, and ye ſhall find Reſt for your Souls.* If therefore *Popery* be the Old Path, if it be from the Beginning, if it be from the Apoſtles, then is it the *true Chriſtianity*, and not a moſt corrupt Religion, as we have held it to be ever ſince the Reformation. We ſhould then, for this Reaſon, take great Care not to give the Name of *Popery* to that which is *Primitive* (foraſmuch as what is truly *Primitive* is and muſt be the Truth, whereas by *Popery* we underſtand *Corruption* and *Error*) leſt we give great Advantage to the Emiſſaries of *Rome*, who having proved ſome Doctrines, called *Popiſh*, to be indeed Ancient,

---

(a) Id eſt verum quodcunque primum: Id eſt adulterum quodcunque poſterius. *Tertul. adverſ. Prax. prope princip.*

(b) Conſtat id verius quod prius, id prius quod ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apoſtolis. *Tertul. adverſ. Marcion. Lib. 4. prope princip.* (c) *Jer.* vi. 16.

Catho-

Catholick and Apoſtolical, may thence take Occaſion to perſuade thoſe who have not Opportunities and Abilities to examine the Records of the ancient Church (which are much the greateſt Number of Men) that even their real Errors and Corruptions are as Ancient, Catholick and Apoſtolical as theſe. Thus, for Inſtance, *The Independency of the Church upon the State, as to its pure Spiritual Powers*, is a Doctrine which ſome have been pleaſed to charge as *Popiſh*. Now this being (as I truſt I ſhall be able to prove) moſt certainly and evidently a true Chriſtian Doctrine, may not a *Romiſh* Emiſſary make great Advantage from ſuch an unjuſt Charge? 'You ſee here, ſays ſuch an one 'to an honeſt well-meaning Perſon, how your 'Teachers impoſe upon you, and affright you 'with a mere Bug-bear Word. They have 'trained you up to be afraid of the Name *Popery*, but if you come to examine what they 'mean by that Word, it is plain they only underſtand ſomething which they do not like, and 'which therefore they would not have you like; 'not that the Thing is, in itſelf, corrupt and 'erroneous, but they have ſome Ends to ſerve 'by making you think it is. They tell you, for 'Inſtance, That to believe *the Church has any 'Powers independent on the State*, is *Popery*: Upon which you immediately conclude, that it 'is an abominable, wicked Doctrine, and reject it without farther Examination. But now 'I will ſhew you that this is the Doctrine

'of

'of *Christ*, of his Apostles, and of the whole '*Christian* Church downwards:' And accordingly plainly shews and convinces the Man that the Thing is so. And having so convinced him, which may very easily be done even from the Scriptures themselves, he then proceeds and says, 'You see now how your Guides deceive 'you, they have bred you up from your In-'fancy to an Abhorrence of the Name *Popery*, 'and now you see what they call *Popery* is no 'other than *Christianity* itself, the very Doctrine 'of *Christ* and his Apostles. I have shewed 'you this in one Point, I will now shew it you 'in others.' Then he proceeds to other Points lately charged as *Popish*, and shews them also to be the Doctrine of *Christ*, and his Apostles; and then says, *Will you any longer trust to Guides who have so deceived you?*

What shall a plain honest Man do in this Case? He finds his own Guides have deceived him, this *Romish* Emissary has undeceived him in several Points. He has not Time or Opportunity to examine all the Particulars of the *Romish* Religion, but considers that it is not proper to trust those any longer with the Care of his Soul, who have so evidently imposed upon his Understanding: And that it will be better for him to be guided by the Man that has undeceived him in so many Particulars. Hereupon he gives himself up to the Guidance of this cunning Emissary, who, by this Means, draws him in to be reconciled to the *Roman* Communion, and being

being ſo reconciled, he then embraces all their corrupt Doctrines without any farther Examination. This is the natural Effect of giving the Name *Popery* to ſuch Doctrines as are not really ſo, but are ſo plainly and evidently the Doctrines of the truly Primitive Church.

§ II. Whereas on the other hand, would we rightly and truly inform our People what are the Doctrines of the truly Primitive Church, would the Governors of the Church reſtore thoſe Parts of the firſt reform'd Liturgy, in King *Edward* the VIth's Days, which were expung'd chiefly to gratify Foreign Presbyterians, who nevertheleſs did then, and ſtill do refuſe to come into the Epiſcopal Communion; and which Liturgy was, by the First *Act for Uniformity*, declared to have been Finiſhed by the Aid of the Holy Ghoſt; whereof we have no Reaſon to doubt, ſince the Compilers of that Firſt Liturgy had ſo great a Regard to the *Holy Scripture*, and the Uſages of the Primitive Church for the firſt Four Centuries of Chriſtianity; all which Time it muſt be allowed that the Church continued in its greateſt Purity: Would we, in our Sermons and Diſcourſes, ſhew the People, that what we call *Popery* is a Corruption and Deviation from theſe Doctrines and Practices of the Primitive Church, introduced ſince that Time by the Biſhop of *Rome* and thoſe of his Communion: Would we ſhew them what thoſe Corruptions are, and how they have been ſummed up by the Pope himſelf in the Additional Articles

ticles to the Apostles Creed, of which I have given an Account in *my Vindication*: Would we thus inform the Flocks committed to our Charge what *Popery* is, and what is *true Primitive Christianity*, we should certainly deprive the *Romish* Emissaries of many Advantages they now have of seducing People to their Communion.

§ III. In order therefore to give People right Notions of these Matters, and as far as lies in me to deprive the *Romish* Emissaries of the Advantages they may take from some Peoples calling those Things *Popish* which really are not so; since the giving the Name of *Popery* to that which is truly Christian and Primitive, may so naturally give those Emissaries an Handle to represent such Guides as Deceivers, and thereby to seduce well meaning, but unwary Persons to their abominably corrupt Religion; as I have, in *my Vindication*, shewed the World, from the Creed of Pope *Pius*, what are the corrupt Doctrines of the *Romish* Communion, and also that some Doctrines of *Primitive Christianity*, which have lately been pleaded for, are not *Popery* nor *favouring of Popery*, as some would misrepresent them to be; I shall now, in farther Prosecution of the same Argument, re-consider those Doctrines, more fully prove them to be Primitive and Christian, shew the Usefulness of them, and how all the People may be trained up to the Knowledge and Understanding of them, and thereby be the better secured from the Subtlety of *Romish* Emissaries.

§ IV.

§ IV. I ſhall take them in their Order as they are laid down in (*d*) *my Vindication*, adding only two more Particulars which I am ſenſible are of equal Antiquity and Univerſality with the others: Which are, 1ſt, The *mixing Water with the Wine in the Celebration of the Holy Euchariſt*: And, 2dly, The *Practice of Chriſm in Confirmation.* And if any other Matters, not yet received or practiſed in our Church, ſhould be found to be of equal Antiquity and Univerſality, I declare it to be my hearty Deſire that they alſo may be reſtored: For I am well aſſured, that from the Beginning of the Goſpel of *Chriſt*, to the Time of the Council of *Nice*, and long after, during the Fourth Century, the Catholick Church, all over the World, was united in one Holy Doctrine, Diſcipline and Manner of Worſhip. It is certain that the Biſhops, who met in that celebrated Council, came from all the known Parts of the *Chriſtian* World, and were all entirely of the ſame Communion: For although there were two or three *Arians* who differed from the reſt in the Senſe of an Article of Faith, yet neither then nor after does it appear that they differed in their Manner of Worſhip; nor, till the Church thought fit to expell them for their Heretical Pravity, did they innovate any thing in the Publick Offices. Indeed, during theſe firſt Ages, there was ſome

(d) *Pag.* 22, 23.

Diſ-

Difference between the *Aſiaticks* and ſome other *Chriſtian* Churches, about the Day whereon *Eaſter* ſhould be kept; but even that Difference was adjuſted by this Council, and all were brought to an Uniform Practice alſo in that Point. The Practice of the Church therefore at the Time of the Council of *Nice*, is certainly beſt fitted to be the Standard for every Reformation of the Church. And when I conſider what was done by our Reformers in the firſt Liturgy of King *Edward* VI, I am fully convinced they intended to make the firſt three or four Centuries the only Pattern for themſelves, and purpoſed to reform all the corrupt Doctrines and Practices of the *Roman* Church, to make them agreeable to the Practice of thoſe Ages: But were induced afterwards (as we have Reaſon to believe) upon Political Reaſons, to lay aſide divers of thoſe ancient Doctrines and Practices, to gratify *Calvin*, *Bucer*, and other Foreign *Presbyterians*, in order to ſecure a Party abroad: But that Party abroad, inſtead of aſſiſting and defending our Church, which had yielded ſo much to gratify it, and gain its good Will, on the contrary raiſed ſuch a Party at home againſt our Conſtitution, both in Church and State, as once prevailed ſo far as to overturn both, and have ever ſince been as Thorns in our Sides, and a Snare unto us.

§ V. Since then we have ſeen and experienced the Folly of deviating ſo far from the Primitive Plan, to gain thoſe who cannot be gained by

by any thing but the utter Extirpation of Epiſcopacy and Liturgy, and all that is not according to their own Novel Fancies, why ſhould we not entirely reſtore our Liturgy to the Primitive Standard, and revive thoſe Uſages which were retained by our firſt Reformers before they had any Thoughts of gratifying the *Calvinian* Party? Which has been ſo far from being gained by thoſe unwary Conceſſions, that it has only given them an Opportunity to do us the greateſt Miſchief. But by returning to thoſe Uſages, we ſhall plainly lead the Van for the Introduction of Catholick Unity into the Church of *Chriſt*: For we ſhall then want nothing (as we now moſt certainly do) that is agreeable to the Practice of the Primitive Church, when a Catholick Uniformity was univerſally preſerved. Whilſt theſe Doctrines and Uſages I am now pleading for were obſerved, the Church-Univerſal was united in the ſame Faith, Diſcipline and Worſhip. The laying them aſide has been the Cauſe of our Diſ-union. The only Means to remove this Diſ-union, is by every Church's returning to a cloſer Union with the Primitive Church in Doctrine, Diſcipline and Worſhip: For as the Church never was ſo ſtrictly and firmly united as in the Primitive Times, and particularly about the Time when the Council of *Nice* was celebrated, becauſe whatever Differences might then be between particular Churches about faſting upon the *Saturday*, or any other indifferent Rite or Cuſtom, yet this made no Difference

between them as to Faith, Discipline and Worship; that was one and the same in all Places: So if ever the Church be as firmly united again, it must be upon the same Principles and Practices. The Church never was united but upon the Principles and Usages which obtained at the Time of the *Nicene* Council: And we have therefore good Reason to believe that it never can be united, but upon those Principles and Usages. That Church then which shall first restore all those Principles and Usages, may be justly said to lead the Way to Catholick Union. And this is the Reason why I cannot forbear to plead so earnestly in Behalf of these Primitive Doctrines, and am so desirous to see them revived amongst us, if possible.

---

## *POSTSCRIPT.*

WHereas, in the Second Edition of a Book called, *An Account of Church-Government*, &c. which I publish'd in the Year 1710. I have, Page 38, *&c.* charged the *Non-jurors* with *Conventicling* and *Schism*; I do here, in the Face of the World, recall that Charge, *Retracting* (as I then declared *I should be ready to do upon better Information*) whatever I have there, or any where else, laid down or asserted in Opposition to my present Practice, or in Vindication of that Compliance to which I then thought it my Duty to submit: Referring all those who have been misguided by the Erroneous Arguments made use of upon that Occasion to this small Treatise of the *Independency of the Church*; and another I lately publish'd, entituled, *Dr.* Bennet's *Concessions to the Non-jurors*, &c. *Lond.* 1717. In which they will find the Reasons and Grounds of that Accusation sufficiently answered and confuted, and the *Non-jurors* vindicated from the Imputation of *Schism*. And to this End, I earnestly intreat them to give them both an impartial Reading.

THE

# THE INDEPENDENCY OF THE CHURCH UPON THE STATE, &c.

§ I. HE pure Spiritual Powers of the Church are, (a) *to publish the Gospel of Christ, and thereby to make Converts to his Religion*; (b) *to admit such Converts into the Church by Baptism*; (c) *to impose Hands on them for their Reception of the Holy Ghost, which we call by the Name of Confirmation*; (d) *to ordain Bishops, or other inferiour Pastors, in every City or other Place, as there shall be Occasion, to feed and watch over the Flocks committed to*

(a) *Matth.* xxviii. 19. *Mar.* xvi. 15.
(b) *Matth.* xxviii. 20. *Mar.* xvi. 16. *Act.* ii. 38.
(c) *Act.* viii. 17. and xix. 6. *Hebr.* vi. 2.
(d) *Act.* vi. 3, 6. and xiv. 23. 1 *Tim.* iv. 14. 2 *Tim.* i. 6. *Tit.* i. 5.

*their Charge*; (e) *to require the People to receive and obey the Spiritual Guides thus set over them*; (f) *to give them a sufficient Maintenance*; (g) *and to account of them as the Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of the Mysteries of God*; (h) *to keep stedfastly in the Communion of their Rightful Pastors, to assemble with them for Religious Worship to offer up Prayers and Praises to God, and to receive from their Hands the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*; (i) *to excommunicate or repell notorious Offenders from the Communion of the Church, and to re-admit them again upon due Testimonies of Repentance.* These are plainly the Spiritual Powers of the Church; and it is evident from the Scriptures, that *Christ* committed all this Power to his Apostles; that they likewise committed the same Power to others whom they set over the several Churches which they founded in the several Parts of the World, with Authority to continue this Succession of faithful Pastors throughout all Ages; and this without any Application to the *Roman* Emperor, or any other Civil Magistrate whatsoever, for his farther Commission to authorize or empower them to do these Things. Nay, the Civil Magistrate frequently impeded them in the Exercise of these Powers; and it was soon made Death by the Imperial Laws to exercise or obey any such Powers, that is, to be either a *Christian* Priest or Laick; and these Laws continu'd in Force against them (only as they were for some short Intervals suspended, or the Non-Execution of them connived at) for three hundred Years: In which Space *Chri-*

(e) *Phil.* ii. 29. 1 *Thess.* v. 12, 13. 1 *Tim.* v. 17. *Hebr.* xiii. 7, 17.
(f) 1 *Cor.* ix. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. *Gal.* vi. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. 1 *Tim.* v. 17, 18.
(g) 1 *Cor.* iv. 1. *Col.* i. 25.
(h) *Act.* ii. 42. and xi. 26. 1 *Cor.* x. 16. and xi. 20. *Hebr.* x. 25.
(i) 1 *Cor.* v. 3, 4, 5. 2 *Cor.* ii. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

*stians*

*ſtians* endured ten very ſevere Perſecutions. Yet all that time the Church not only continu'd to exiſt, but wonderfully increas'd every Day, till at laſt it brought both Emperor and Empire into its Communion, and obtain'd the Protection of the State. But did this transferr any of theſe Powers to the Emperor, or any Civil Magiſtrate whatſoever? By no means. The Emperor or Sovereign, by becoming *Chriſtian*, did not acquire any Spiritual Power or Authority; he could neither preach the Word, nor adminiſter Sacraments, nor commiſſion any Perſon to perform thoſe Offices, who had not before derived an Authority from *Chriſt*, or according to his Inſtitution in that Caſe. The Emperors were admitted into the Church, by no other Means, nor on any other Conditions, than other Men: Their Admiſſion, like that of all others, was by Baptiſm, adminiſtred to them exactly in the ſame Form as to all others; conſequently they could acquire no more Spiritual Rights or Privileges by it, than any other Men. They were thereby, indeed, made Spiritual Sons of the Church, but by no means Spiritual Fathers: That is a Power to be acquired no otherwiſe than by Ordination.

§ II. It has been objected by ſome (weakly enough) that the Scripture itſelf (*k*) tells us, That *Kings and Queens ſhall be the Nurſing-Fathers and Mothers of the Church*. From whence they would inferr, that every *Chriſtian King* and *Queen* is a *Spiritual Father* and *Mother*. But after all, there is no ſuch Words as *Father* or *Mother* in this Text, except in our *Engliſh* Tranſlation; and there it is far from meaning what ſome heedleſly and unwarily would gather from it. For the Tranſlators fairly tell us in the

(k) *Iſa.* xlix. 23.

Margin of the Bible, that the Word which they tranſlate *Nurſing-Fathers*, in the *Hebrew*, or Original, is no more than *Nouriſhers*; and they might alſo have told us, that the Word which they tranſlate *Nurſing-Mothers*, ſignifies only *Nurſes giving Suck*; and ſo all other Tranſlations, but ours, have rendred both theſe Words. So that thoſe who would build any thing of a Spiritual Fatherhood or Motherhood from this Text, have nothing but a meer *Angliciſm* on which they can lay their Foundation. But read the whole Text, and the Matter will be yet more clear. *Kings ſhall be thy Nurſing-Fathers, and their Queens thy Nurſing-Mothers: They ſhall bow to thee with their Face towards the Earth, and lick up the Duſt of thy Feet.* What can be plainer from hence, than that Kings and Queens, like true Nouriſhers and Cheriſhers, ſhould protect and defend the Church from all outward Wrong and Violence, and ſhould bow down before the Guides and Governors of it, to receive the Word and Sacraments at their Hands, and to ſubmit to the Doctrine and Diſcipline of *Chriſt*, as miniſtred by them? And ought not all Chriſtian Kings and Princes to do this? Nay, have not all godly Princes acted in this manner?

§ III. However, the Pope, the grand Corrupter of Chriſtianity, taking upon him, under Pretence of maintaining the Independency of the Church, to exempt ſome Cauſes, and ſome Perſons, from all Civil Subjection to their Princes, gave the Princes a juſt Occaſion to reject this uſurped Power: And at the Reformation, when divers Princes and States, and ours among the reſt, not able to bear theſe Uſurpations and Encroachments, found it neceſſary to ſhake off the Papal Yoke, gave Occaſion to many Controverſies on this Subject, and many Books were written, and Laws made concerning this Matter. And becauſe the Pope had ſtrained the Matter

too

too high on the Church ſide, thoſe who wrote of the other ſide, thought it impoſſible to carry Matters too high that way. Hereupon, when theſe Things were debated here in the Reign of King *Henry* VIII. ſome ſtrange and particular Notions were then firſt advanced; of which an Account is given us by Biſhop *Burnet*, in the firſt Volume (*l*) of his *Hiſtory of the Reformation.*

§ IV. Here the Queſtion was put in this Manner, *Whether the Apoſtles lacking a higher Power, as in not having a Chriſtian King among them, made Biſhops by that Neceſſity, or by Authority given by God?* Archbiſhop *Cranmer* gave a long Anſwer to this, which would be tedious to recite here. But the Subſtance of it is, *That all Biſhops, Parſons, Vicars, and ſuch other Prieſts, are to be appointed to their ſeveral Offices by the Prince, in ſuch Manner as Civil Officers are, and that they have no Power or Authority in Spiritual Matters, but what they receive from the Prince: That the Apoſtles and Biſhops of the Primitive Church exerciſed this Power only through Neceſſity, as being choſen by the People for that Purpoſe, becauſe there was then no Chriſtian Prince.* An Opinion for which he could not produce the leaſt Authority from Scripture; nor did he pretend to give any. But he knew it would be very agreeable to the Humour of that arbitrary Prince, whoſe Pleaſure ſeems generally to have had a great Influence on the Principles of this Prelate. But I find no other Biſhop or Divine came entirely up to this Opinion, except the Biſhop of S. *David*'s, who declared, *That becauſe they lacked a Chriſtian Prince, by that Neceſſity they ordained other Biſhops.* Others, who could not come up to this Opinion entirely, when they had declared *That the Apoſtles made*

(1) *Collection of Records, Book* III. *Num.* 21. *Queſt.* 9.

*Bishops and Priests by Authority given unto them of Christ*; yet, to mitigate the Matter, put in a Supposition of their own, without pretending any other Ground for it, *That they supposed they ought to have asked Licence of their Christian Governors, if then there had been any.* But others plainly said, *That the Apostles made Priests by their own Power given them by God, and that they had no need of any other Power.* And if the Power was given them by God, as all the rest also confess'd, except the Archbishop of *Canterbury* and the Bishop of S. *David*'s, they *could have no need* of any other Power: For certainly *no Human Power can be needful* to confirm or corroborate a Power given by God.

§ V. The next Question but one is put in these Words, *Whether a Bishop hath Authority to make a Priest by Scripture, or no? And whether any other but only a Bishop may make a Priest?* Archbishop *Cranmer* answers as before, *A Bishop may make a Priest by the Scripture, and so may Princes and Governors also, and that by the Authority of God committed to them, and the People also by their Election: For as we read, That Bishops have done it, and the People, before Christian Princes were, did commonly elect their Bishops and Priests.* It seems, this great Man could not distinguish between *Nominating* or *Electing*, and *Making* or *Ordaining* a Bishop or Priest. But, sure, every Body else must see the Difference. A General of an Army, for Instance, has a Friend whom he is willing to oblige in any Request, or whom perhaps for some particular Reasons he dares not disoblige; this Person recommends one to him to be made an Officer in the Army, and accordingly the General gives that Person a Commission; will any one say that it was the Recommendation or Nomination made that Person an Officer, and not the Commission? Whereas had he been recommended or nominated ten thousand times over,

yet

yet without the General's Commiſſion he could have had no Command in the Army. So alſo Princes have generally had ſuch an Influence over the Biſhops that have been their Subjects, that they have not dared to refuſe to conſecrate or ordain ſuch as they have nominated to them; but ſtill it was not the Nomination made thoſe Perſons Prieſts or Biſhops, but the Conſecration or Ordination. And where the Biſhops have refuſed the Perſon ſo nominated, which has ſometimes happen'd, the Nomination has been of no Service to him; it has been found that could not make him either Biſhop or Prieſt. But this Learned Archbiſhop (for ſo undoubtedly he was, however in this and many other Inſtances his Judgment ſeems to have been byaſſed by his King) pretends it may be proved by Scripture, that *Princes and Governors may make a Prieſt*, whereas there is not an Inſtance of a Prince or Governor in all the Scripture, that did make a Prieſt, except *Jeroboam* the Son of *Nebat*; and this was ſo far from being approved or allowed by God, that it is expreſly recorded, (*m*) that *this Thing became Sin unto the Houſe of* Jeroboam, *even to cut it off, and deſtroy it from off the Face of the Earth.* He adds, *the People alſo* may do it by *their Election.* And there is indeed one Inſtance (*n*) of the People's electing ſeven Men to be made *Deacons* or *Miniſters.* But it is plain, that it was not the People's Election, but the Apoſtles Appointment and Ordination which made thoſe Men Miniſters. The Apoſtles Words are, *Look ye out ſeven Men of honeſt Report, full of the Holy Ghoſt and Wiſdom.* And what follows? Do they ſay, when you have choſen theſe Men, they will, by vertue of this Election, have Authority to execute the Office to which they are deſigned? No ſuch Thing. But *look ye out Men*, not whom *ye*, but whom

(m) 1 *King.* xiii. 34. (n) *Act.* vi.

WE *may appoint over this Business.* And accordingly they chose seven according to the Apostles Direction, whom they set before the Apostles: *And when they had prayed, they*, the Apostles, *laid their Hands on them.* So that here is a plain Difference between Choosing or Nominating, and Making or Ordaining a Minister. The Apostles gave the People Leave to nominate or choose fit Persons to be Ministers or Deacons, but reserved the Making, Appointing, or Ordaining them to that Office entirely to themselves. And it was plainly not the Election, but the Ordination, or Appointment by Imposition of Hands, that made them Deacons. Had they been only elected by the People, and not appointed or ordained by the Apostles, they had been no Ministers of the Church. And Archbishop *Cranmer* himself was inconsistent with the Opinion which he gave in this Answer; for in *another Answer* of his to this same Question given us by (o) *Strype*, he says, *We read not, that any other, not being a Bishop, hath since the Beginning of Christ's Church ordained a Priest.* However, the Bishop of S. *David*'s thought fit to say upon this Occasion, *That Bishops have no Authority to make Priests, without they be authorized of the Christian Prince.* But in this he was singular; for the others, all of them, did say, that *Bishops be authorized of God to make Priests.* Some of them indeed did add, *That they cannot use this Authority, without their Christian Prince does permit them*; but the Majority did not give their Opinion with that Limitation.

§ VI. Now this being the most material Point with relation to the *Independency of the Church upon the State*, viz. *Whether Bishops, who are the chief Governors of the Church, derive their Authority from God,*

(o) *Memor. of Archbishop* Cranmer, *Appendix, Num.* xxviii. § xi.

*er*

*or from the Christian Prince?* I could not but think it proper to be very particular in this Matter. And the Reign of King *Henry* VIII. being, I am perſuaded, the firſt time this was made a Queſtion, I judged it convenient to give an Account how the Queſtion was then propoſed, and what Anſwers were made to it. But as the Anſwers were then various, and contrary to one another, ſo have the Opinions been ever ſince: That is, there has ever ſince been a Party, who have eſpouſed the Opinions then given by Archbiſhop *Cranmer* and Biſhop *Barlow*, (though it is evident *Cranmer* did not always hold that Opinion) who, from *Thomas Eraſtus*, a *Dutch* Phyſician, (who I think was the firſt that wrote a Book on purpoſe to pretend to prove it) have been called *Eraſtians:* Who has ſince been followed by *Prynne* and *Hobbs*, and the Author of the Book falſly called *The Rights of the Chriſtian Church*, and many others. But it is not my Purpoſe at this time to examine the Arguments theſe Men, or any of their Followers, have brought to prove their Opinion in this Caſe: I think it will be ſufficient to ſhew, that it is directly contrary to the Scriptures; and then every one that believes the Scriptures, muſt ſee, that whatever Arguments they have, or can produce, muſt be falſe and groundleſs.

§ VII. The Scriptures teach us, (*p*) that *Chriſt is the Head of the Body, the Church.* Conſequently, whoever has any Power in that Body, muſt derive it from him. For no Man can challenge a Power in a Body, Society, or Corporation of Men, but he who derives it from the Head of that Corporation. And *Chriſt* tells us, (*q*) that *all Power is given unto him both in Heaven and in Earth*; that is, all Spiritual

(p) *Col.* i. 18. (q) *Matth.* xxviii. 18.

Power,

Power, all Power relating to his Spiritual Body the Church, as S. *Paul* explains it, who tells us, (x) That God *put all things under his Feet, and gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church.* For as to Temporal Power, our Saviour expreſly diſclaim'd it, when he ſaid, (y) *Who made me a Judge or a Divider over you?* Though he had before declared (z) *all things to have been deliver'd to him of the Father.* And again, a little before his Death, he denied all Pretenſions to Temporal Power, ſaying to *Pilate*, (a) *My Kingdom is not of this World.* He did not ſay, *My Kingdom is not* in *this World:* For his Church which is here on Earth, is his Kingdom, but not of *this World*, becauſe it is govern'd in another Manner than the Kingdoms of the World are, and its Rewards and Puniſhments are to be diſtributed in another Place. Therefore, as he is a King, and in this World too, with regard to his Church, and as all Power in that reſpect *is committed to him*, therefore all Spiritual or Church-Power muſt be derived from him: For if any one can have a Spiritual Power not derived from him, then has not Chriſt All *Spiritual Power.* But he has All; therefore whoever has any, muſt have it from him. We have then nothing more to do, but to enquire to whom he committed this Power.

§ VIII. It is certain, he committed it not to the Magiſtrate: For there was no Magiſtrate at that time, that would or did receive and acknowledge *Chriſt*, but all generally oppoſed him. Neither did he commit it to the People, or to his Diſciples in general; for though (b) *as many as received him, to them gave he Power to become the Sons of God*, yet he did not make all (c) *his Miniſters and Stewards of his*

(x) *Eph.* i. 22. (y) *Luk.* xii. 14. (z) *Luk.* x. 22.
(a) *Joh.* xviii. 36. (b) *Joh.* i. 12. (c) 1 *Cor.* iv. 1.

*Myſteries.*

*Myſteries.* (d) But he ſet only *ſome in the Church* to be *firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers*, &c. whereas had he equally commiſſion'd *all* his Diſciples, then *all* would have been *Apoſtles, all Prophets*, &c. That is, as S. *Paul* obſerves, (e) *All would have been one Member: And where then were the Body?* Now, our Saviour had a great Multitude of Diſciples in his own Life-time; ſo that the *Phariſees* complain'd of it, and ſaid, (f) *Behold, the World is gone after him*; yet out of all theſe he at firſt (g) *ordained but Twelve, that they ſhould be with him, and that he might ſend them forth to preach.* (h) And *afterwards he appointed other ſeventy alſo.* He did not authorize all his Diſciples promiſcuouſly to go out and preach in his Name, but only ſuch as he himſelf choſe and ſent. And when he was about to aſcend into Heaven, then he delegated this and all other Spiritual Powers to his Apoſtles, ſaying, (i) *As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you.* And accordingly we find the Apoſtles did chooſe and ſend in like manner, (k) *and ordained them Elders in every Church*: And alſo committed the ſame Power of chooſing and ſending Presbyters, Prieſts, or Elders to others: As S. *Paul* tells *Titus*, ſaying, (l) *For this cauſe left I thee in* Crete, *that thou ſhouldſt ſet in Order the Things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I appointed thee.* And no Inſtance can be given throughout the whole new Teſtament, of any Perſons being ſent to preach the Goſpel, or to perform any Functions belonging to the Miniſtry of the Goſpel, that is, to exerciſe any Spiritual Powers, who was not commiſſioned to do ſo by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, or by ſome Perſon, ſuch as

(d) 1 *Cor.* xii. 28. (e) 1 *Cor.* xii. 19. (f) *Joh.* xii. 19.
(g) *Mar.* iii. 14. (h) *Luk.* x. 1. (i) *Joh.* xx. 21.
(k) *Acts* xiv. 23. (l) *Tit.* i. 5.

*Timothy*

*Timothy* or *Titus*, vested by the Apostles, with Apostolical or Episcopal Authority. Nay, the whole History of the Church will not afford an Instance of any Persons being allowed to be a Bishop or Priest in the Church of God, but such as have received their Ordination from Bishops deriving their Succession from *Christ* and his Apostles, till *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, and their Followers, (who have met with too many Disciples in this Realm) taught new and strange Doctrines, and would derive all Church-Power either from the Prince or People, just as it fitted their Purpose best. But whence could the Prince or People derive this Power? It is certain, *All Spiritual Power* is vested in *Christ*. He gave it to his Apostles and their Successors the Bishops, as the Scripture plainly teaches, and to no others, neither Prince nor People: How then can either Prince or People come by this Power?

§ IX. They tell us, that it must be in the Prince, because all Power is in him, and therefore he must have a Spiritual as well as a Temporal Power; and it is a Contradiction to say, That any Supreme Power should have another Power within his Dominions, independent on him. This is their main Argument, and all they have said on this occasion depends on this. But this is contradictory to Scripture, and therefore false. For our Saviour (who utterly disclaim'd all Temporal Power, as has been shewed) yet claim'd this Spiritual Power, and exercised it here on Earth as long as he continued with us, independent on the Civil Magistrate; for he claimed it as (m) *delivered to him of the Father*. The Apostles also claimed it as (n) committed to them by God, and therefore to be exercised by them,

(m) *Mat.* xi. 27. (n) *Acts* iv. 19.

not-

notwithſtanding any Prohibition from the Civil Magiſtrate; therefore to ſay, That no Power, and particularly this Spiritual Power, can be exerciſed independent on the Supreme Civil Magiſtrate, is directly to contradict the Scriptures: And muſt be falſe. It is evident, from the Scriptures and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that *Chriſt*, his Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors the Biſhops of the Primitive Church, exerciſed this Authority which is now claimed as belonging to the preſent Biſhops of the Church at this Day: And it is as evident, that they did not receive it, or any Part of it, from the Civil Magiſtrate, who was ſo far from allowing them any ſuch Authority, that he perſecuted them for exerciſing it. Now, if they had not a Divine Right to this Authority independent on the Magiſtrate, then that which they called a Perſecution, was but a due and legal Execution of the Laws upon them, and (o) they ſuffer'd not as Martyrs for *Chriſtianity*, for they had no Commiſſion from the Emperor to preach, baptize, conſecrate the Euchariſt, ordain, or excommunicate; but were expreſly forbidden to do any of thoſe Things by many Emperors, particularly by *Nero*, *Domitian*, *Decius*, and *Diocleſian*; conſequently, if they would do theſe things, and ſuffer for it, having no independent Authority with relation to ſuch Matters, they all ſuffer'd juſtly, and *as Buſy-Bodies in other Mens Matters*. But if we believe that *Chriſt*, and his Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors, were Martyrs, (p) and *bore Witneſs to the Truth*; then muſt we believe that they all held this Spiritual Power I have been treating of, Independent on the Civil Magiſtrate; ſince it is ſo evident, from the Scriptures and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that they

(o) 1 *Pet.* iv. 15, 16. (p) *Joh.* xviii. 37.

all

all both claimed and exercised it, even though the Civil Magistrate not only gave them no Commission for that purpose, but directly prohibited and hindred them in the Exercise of it, as much as he was able.

§ X. But at the Beginning of the Reformation, a new and before unheard-of Title was invented for the Civil Magistrate, and our King *Henry* VIII. would be called Supreme Head in Earth of the Church of England, and forced all Persons (*q*) by his Acts of Parliament, under the severest Penalties to acknowledge him to be so. And from this strange and before unknown Title, which the *Christian* Church never heard of till that time, are derived all the Pretences to Spiritual Power, which some suppose to be lodged in the King or Supreme Magistrate. And indeed, if the King had a just Right to this Title, it might imply that the Church cannot be in any respect independent on him. For if he be the only Supreme Head in Earth of the Church of England, as the Statute (but God be praised it is a Statute long since repealed) declares him to be, then all that have any Authority in the Church of *England*, must derive it from him: The Word of God cannot be preached, the Sacraments administred, or any Persons authorized to minister those Ordinances, but by him: Because, if they can derive an Authority from any one else, independent on him, to preach, and minister the Sacraments, then is he not the only Supreme Head. According to this Doctrine, there was no occasion for Ordination of a Priest, or Consecration of a Bishop, for any Spiritual Purposes; the King's Commission alone

(q) 26 H. VIII. *c.* 1. & 28 Hen. VIII. *c.* 7. & 10.

was

was ſufficient. And ſo Archbiſhop *Cranmer* declared about that time, as appears from his Anſwer to the Queſtion before cited. *All Chriſtian Princes*, ſays he, *have committed into them immediately of God the whole Cure of all their Subjects, as well concerning the Adminiſtration of God's Word, for the Cure of Souls, as concerning the Miniſtration of Things Political, and Civil Governance: And in both theſe Miniſtrations, they muſt have ſundry Miniſters under them to ſupply that, which is appointed to their ſeveral Offices. The Civil Miniſters under the King's Majeſty, in this Realm of* England, *be thoſe whom it ſhall pleaſe his Highneſs for the Time to put in Authority under him: As for Example, The Lord Chancellor, Lord Treaſurer, Lord Great Maſter, Lord Privy Seal, Lord Admiral, Mayors, Sheriffs*, &c. *The Miniſters of God's Word, under his Majeſty, be the Biſhops, Parſons, Vicars, and ſuch other Prieſts, as be appointed by his Highneſs to that Miniſtration: As for Example, The Biſhop of* Canterbury, *the Biſhop of* Dureſme, *the Biſhop of* Wincheſter, *the Parſon of* Winwick, *&c.* ALL *the ſaid Officers and Miniſters, as well of that ſort as the other, be appointed, aſſigned, and elected, and in every Place by the Laws and Orders of Kings and Princes. In the Admiſſion of many of theſe Officers, be divers comely Ceremonies and Solemnities uſed, which be not of Neceſſity, but only for a good Order and ſeemly Faſhion; for if ſuch Offices and Miniſtrations were committed without ſuch Solemnity, they were nevertheleſs truly committed: And there is no more Promiſe of God, that Grace is given in the Committing of the Eccleſiaſtical Office, than it is in the Committing the Civil Office.* Now, this Doctrine deliver'd by this Archbiſhop, is a very natural plain Conſequence of making a King or other Civil Magiſtrate *Supreme Head of the Church*: For if he be ſo, *all Spiritual Power* as well as *Temporal* muſt be deriv'd from him, and he may commit it to whom he pleaſes, and in what Manner he pleaſes. But then, as it is

agreeable

agreeable to that *Supreme Headship*, which was at that time ſuppoſed to be veſted in the Chriſtian Prince by Act of Parliament, it is plainly oppoſite to the Holy Scriptures; which give no ſuch Authority to Kings and Princes, but declare *Chriſt* alone to be the *Supreme Head of his Church*, and teach us that he committed no Part of this Authority to any Civil Magiſtrate, but to his Apoſtles only, and to their Succeſſors *whom he ſent, as he was ſent of the Father*, as has been already proved. And whereas Archbiſhop *Cranmer* ſays, *there is no more Promiſe of God, that Grace is given in the Committing of the Eccleſiaſtical Office, than it is in the Committing of the Civil Office*, that is alſo contrary to plain Scripture. For when *Chriſt* committed the Eccleſiaſtical Office to his Apoſtles, and ſent them forth to preach and baptize, he promiſed them (*r*) *to be with them alway, even unto the End of the World.* Which is as clear a Promiſe as he could make, that his Grace and Holy Spirit ſhould accompany the Miniſtrations then committed to them, not for their Lives only, but throughout all Generations; which muſt neceſſarily imply the like Grace to be continu'd to the Miniſtrations of thoſe who ſhould ſucceed them. But we find no ſuch Promiſe of Grace made to the Civil Magiſtrate, or to any commiſſioned by him.

§ XI. However, King *Henry* VIII. having taken upon him the Title of *Supreme Head of the Church*, thought it proper to exerciſe it in its full Extent: (*s*) And accordingly made the Biſhops take out *a ſtrange Commiſſion* (as Biſhop *Burnet* himſelf ſtyles it) *which might give juſt Occaſion to call them the King's*

(r) *Matth.* xxviii. 20.

(s) *Burnet's Hiſt. of Refor.* 4th Edition, *p.* 255. *Collier's Hiſt. Vol.* II. *p.* 169. *Col.* 2.

*Biſhops.*

*Biſhops.* The Subſtance of it was, *That ſince all Juriſdiction, both Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, flowed from the King as* Supreme Head, *and he was the Fountain of all Power; it became thoſe who exerciſed it only* (precariò) *at the King's Courteſy, gratefully to acknowledge, that they had it only of his Bounty; and to declare that they would deliver it up again, when it ſhould pleaſe him to call for it. And ſince the King had conſtituted the Lord* Cromwell *his Vicegerent in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs; yet becauſe he could not look into all thoſe Matters, therefore the King, upon* Bonner's *Petition, did empower him,* in his own Stead, *to ordain ſuch as he found worthy, to preſent and give Inſtitution, with all the other Parts of the Epiſcopal Authority, for which he is duly commiſſionated; and this to laſt during the King's Pleaſure only. And all the Parts of the Epiſcopal Function being reckon'd up, it concluded with a ſtrict Charge to the Biſhop to ordain none but ſuch of whoſe Integrity, good Life, and Learning, he had very good Aſſurance.* Biſhop *Burnet* pretends, that only *Bonner* took ſuch a Commiſſion; but *Anthony Harmer* has ſhewn, that *Cranmer* and many others, and probably all the Biſhops of that Time did the ſame.

§ XII. It appears by this Commiſſion, that the King looked upon himſelf to have full Authority, by vertue of his *Supreme Headſhip*, to ordain Biſhops, Prieſts, or Deacons; for he plainly authorizes the Biſhops, to whom he gave this Commiſſion, *to do this in his own Stead*, which neceſſarily implies that he might have done it himſelf, if he had pleaſed: Nay, that the Lord *Cromwell* his Vicegerent might have done it; for it ſeems, it was only becauſe he was not at Leiſure to look into theſe Matters, that the King was induced to grant theſe Commiſſions to the ſeveral Biſhops. And yet after all, it appears from this very Commiſſion, that King *Henry* VIII. himſelf was not ſatisfy'd that he really had *all* that Power

which he here pretended to, or that the Biſhop had no manner of Power or Authority but what he receiv'd from him, and therefore found it neceſſary to throw theſe Words into the Commiſſion, (as Mr. *Collier* obſerves) *Præter & ultra ea quæ tibi ex ſacris literis Divinitùs commiſſa eſſe dignoſcuntur: Over and above thoſe Things which are known from the Holy Scriptures to have been committed to you by God.* Which Words do effectually overthrow that boundleſs Supremacy pretended to in the other Parts of the Commiſſion. For, if the Biſhops and Paſtors of the Church have any thing immediately committed to them by God, independent on the Civil Magiſtrate, as this Clauſe affirms, then all *Spiritual Power* is not deriv'd from the King, as is pretended in the other Parts of this Commiſſion; conſequently, King *Henry* was not *ſuch a Supreme Head* as he was deſirous to be thought; and by this very Clauſe declares the Scriptures to be againſt that pretended *Headſhip*.

§ XIII. Alſo, though in this Commiſſion he declares all Epiſcopal Power to be deriv'd from himſelf, and that *Cromwell*, his Vicegerent, was veſted with the Authority of all the Biſhops in *England*; yet, when he made his Act of Parliament (which was about the ſame time theſe Commiſſions were granted) for the Election and Conſecration of Archbiſhops and Biſhops, he did not pretend to make Biſhops otherwiſe than they had been made before. For though he carry'd his Right of Patronage, or of Recommending or Nominating the Perſon to be made a Biſhop, to its full Height, beyond the Example of former Ages, and decreed, (*t*) that if the Dean and Chapter *deferr or delay their Election above twelve Days next after the Licence and Letters Miſſive*

(*t*) 25 *Henry* VIII. *Cap.* V.

*are*

*are to them delivered, that then for every such Default, the King's Highness, his Heirs and Successors, at their Liberty and Pleasure, shall nominate and present, by their Letters Patents under their Great Seal, such a Person to the said Office and Dignity, as they shall think able and convenient for the same.* But then, if the Archbishops or Bishops shall refuse or neglect to consecrate him, the Statute does not say, that he shall be taken or reputed for a Bishop notwithstanding. It lays indeed such Archbishop or Bishops refusing under the Penalty of a *Premunire*; but if they had Courage and Constancy to bear that Penalty, even this *Supreme Head of the Church* did not think himself capable of making a Bishop without them, notwithstanding Archbishop *Cranmer*'s Opinion, that these Ceremonies of Consecration or Imposition of Episcopal Hands were not necessary.

§ XIV. This Title of *Supreme Head of the Church* continu'd the remaining Part of King *Henry* VIII's Reign, and throughout that of his Son King *Edw.* VI. but was repealed (*u*) by Queen *Mary*, and never since revived. For Queen *Elizabeth* never was, nor would be called *Supreme Head of the Church*, but contented herself with the Title of *Supreme Governor of this Realm, and of all other her Highness's Realms, Dominions and Countries, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Things or Causes, as Temporal*: And allowed also, that it should be declared in (*w*) the Articles publish'd by her Authority, that *where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief Government, by which Titles we understand the Minds of some slanderous Folks to be offended: We give not to our Princes the Ministring either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which Thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by* Elizabeth

(u) 1 & 2 *Phil. & Mar. Cap* VIII. (w) *Art.* 37.

*our Queen, doth moſt plainly teſtify: But that only Prerogative which we ſee to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himſelf, that is, that they ſhould rule all Eſtates and Degrees committed to their Charge by God, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Temporal, and reſtrain with the CIVIL Sword the Stubborn and Evil-Doers.* Whereby the Regal Supremacy over Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes and Perſons is plainly declared to be no other than *a Civil Power*, and not that Spiritual Power which *Chriſt* committed to his Apoſtles, and is deriv'd from them to the Biſhops and Paſtors of the Church, and which the Words *Supreme Head of the Church* ſeem'd to veſt in the Crown.

§ XV. Since, then, that Title of *Supreme Head of the Church* was a Title aſſum'd by King *Henry* VIII. continu'd only by him and his Son, who liv'd and died in his Minority, and was then repeal'd by Act of Parliament, and never ſince reſtored or made Part of the Regal Title; that it is alſo a Title never known or heard of till that Age, and liable to very ſtrange Conſtructions, even to the utter annulling and deſtroying all that Power which Chriſt committed to his Apoſtles, and from them to the Biſhops and Paſtors of his Church; I have often wonder'd, how ſo many Learned Men have to this Day continu'd to give this Title to our Princes, and how ſo many of the Clergy, in their Prayer before Sermon, ſhould call our King, *next and immediately under Chriſt, Supreme Head:* Since neither our Laws nor our Canons do at this time, or have for theſe hundred and fifty Years and upwards given him this Title. I am perſuaded, that nothing has more contributed to the ſpreading of *Eraſtianiſm*, than this unwary Cuſtom of ſtyling our King *Supreme Head of the Church*, which I am aſſur'd has no Law or Canon now in Force to oblige us; and, I am well ſatisfy'd, has neither

ther Reaſon, Religion, nor Goſpel to induce us to uſe it. For if the King be *Supreme Head of the Church*, then it is impoſſible the Church ſhould ſubſiſt without the King; for no Body, (*x*) and ſuch the Scripture tells us the Church is, can ſubſiſt without its Head. But the Church, we all know, did ſubſiſt during the Time of *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, and above two hundred Years after their Deaths, without having any Sovereign Prince of its Communion; and conſequently, without any Headſhip of any Temporal Prince; for no Man can be Head of a Communion of which he is not ſo much as a Member. And how a Prince can become Head of a Church, by being made a Member of it, I cannot ſee. The Prince is admitted into the Church, juſt as others are, by Baptiſm; but that only makes him a Son or Member of the Church: But it is Conſecration or Ordination alone, that makes Fathers or Heads. And therefore Religious Chriſtian Princes have always eſteemed Biſhops as their Spiritual Fathers; and to this Day they, as well as other Members of the Church, call them their *Right Reverend Fathers in Chriſt*. But are they Fathers to the *Supreme Head of their Church?* This ſeems to be a kind of Contradiction.

§ XVI. Kings then have a *Civil*, not a *Spiritual* Authority over all the Members of the Church. No Man, by becoming a *Chriſtian*, gains any Exemption from that Obedience and Duty which every one owes his Prince, as he is a Subject. Even *Biſhops* themſelves, to whom *Chriſt*, as Succeſſors to the *Apoſtles*, has committed the chief Government of his Church, are not thereby freed from that Allegiance, or any Part of it, which as Temporal Subjects

(*x*) Eph. i. 22, 23. Rom. xiii. 4, 5. 1 Cor. xii. 27. Eph. iv. 12. & v. 23, 30. Col. i. 24.

they owe to their Sovereign: Much leſs therefore can the Inferiour Orders of *Prieſts* and *Deacons* claim any ſuch Exemption. They are all as much Subject to the Supreme Temporal Authority of the Country where they live, as they were or ought to have been before their Ordination. And they are bound to this Obedience even by the Rules and Precepts of that Goſpel which they are to preach to others. The ſame Lord who has committed to them the Spiritual Authority over his Church, has alſo commanded them to be ſubject to the State, not only for Wrath, but alſo for Conſcience ſake. Neither our Saviour nor his Apoſtles pretended to an Exemption from that Obedience which all Subjects owe to the Civil Powers; but upon all Occaſions ſubmitted to, and acknowledged their Authority, and put thoſe in mind who were committed to their Charge, to be ſubject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magiſtrates. It is true, where their Religion was concern'd, where the Magiſtrate commanded what God had forbidden, or where he forbad what God had commanded, they would not obey, becauſe it is neceſſary to obey God rather than Man; yet even in ſuch Caſes they did not reſiſt and oppoſe the Higher Powers with the Sword, or with any Carnal Weapons which God had put into the Temporal Magiſtrates Hands, and forbad them to take into their own Hands in Oppoſition to them; but committing their Cauſe to God, ſubmitted to, and patiently bore ſuch Puniſhments as the Magiſtrate thought fit to lay upon them, and counted it an Honour when they were thought worthy to ſuffer Perſecution for the Name of *Chriſt*; for they knew that he alone had the Power of the Sword, and that although he abuſed that Power in the Perſecution of themſelves, and other Innocent or Well-deſerving Perſons; yet they had no Commiſſion or Authority to wreſt the Sword out

of

of his Hands, and therefore were obliged peaceably to bear his unjuſt Proceedings againſt them; which they always did readily and chearfully, as knowing that God, whom they had choſen to obey, was Lord alſo of the Magiſtrate, and would in his own Time, and by ſuch Means as he thought beſt, do Right to thoſe that ſuffer'd Wrong, and give that unjuſt Magiſtrate Cauſe to wiſh that he had made a better Uſe of his Power.

§ XVII. And as *Spiritual Perſons*, ſo neither are the Temporal Rewards or Puniſhments annex'd to *Spiritual Cauſes* exempt from the *Civil* Juriſdiction of the Magiſtrate. It is he alone, that, by Civil Sanctions, can oblige his Subjects to receive even Chriſtianity itſelf. For though *Chriſt* deſcended from Heaven, and took our Nature upon him that he might publiſh this Religion to the World, and ſettle and eſtabliſh it by promiſing the higheſt Rewards to thoſe which ſhould receive it, and live according to his Doctrine and Precepts; and threatning the ſevereſt Puniſhments to thoſe that ſhould reject it, even to the Magiſtrates as well as others; yet he took not upon him to make any Civil or Temporal Laws concerning his Religion, any more than concerning other Matters. The Rewards which he promiſed, and the Penalties which he threatned, were not Temporal but Eternal, and related not to this Life, but to another; *for his Kingdom is not of this World*. Therefore Civil Rewards or Puniſhments cannot be given or inflicted even in *Spiritual Cauſes*, but by the Magiſtrate, and he muſt be the Judge whether it be proper to beſtow the one, or to inflict the other. Thus, for Inſtance, when the Arch-Heretick *Arius* was convened and tried before the Council of *Nice*, concerning a *Spiritual Cauſe*, even an Article of Faith of the higheſt Conſequence, as whether *our Saviour was True and*

*Eternal God, of one Substance with the Father*; though the *Bishops* were the only Judges whether this was an Heresy and Crime for which he deserved to be expelled from the Communion of the Church; yet *Constantine* the Emperor was the sole Judge, whether he should also be expelled his Native Country, and sent into Banishment. It is true, the *Bishops* might represent to him how dangerous it would be to the Peace of the Church, to let such a Man return to *Alexandria*, where he had done so much Mischief already; but if he would not have hearken'd to them, they had no Means to compell the Emperor to banish him, or to inflict that Punishment on him themselves. As Banishment was a Penalty which none but *Constantine* could lay upon *Arius*, so was he the only Judge whether he should order that Penalty to be executed. For since *Christ* has annexed no Temporal Punishments to the Breach of his Laws, the Civil Magistrate is, and must be Judge of such Matters, *i. e.* whether it be proper to decree a *Temporal* Penalty against those who are only guilty of a *Spiritual* Offence, and likewise to determine what that Penalty shall be. But whether the Magistrate will decree in such a Case or not, or whether he decree according to Right or not, the Matter is still the same; the Person expelled the Communion of the Church by the *Bishops*, to whom alone *Christ* has committed his Keys, will continue an Alien from the Church, and lie under the Spiritual Censures of it, notwithstanding the Magistrate should directly declare the contrary. (*y*) Thus in the Case before-mentioned, when *Constantine* thought fit to recall *Arius* from his Banishment, as believing him to have sincerely repented of his Heresy, yet he

(*y*) Socrat. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 1. cap. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 37, 38.

did

did not pretend to reſtore him to the Peace of the Church by his own Authority, but ſent him to his own Biſhop *Athanaſius* to be by him received into the Boſom of the Church. Indeed, the Emperor did alſo ſend a Mandatory Letter, requiring *Athanaſius* to receive him; but that *Biſhop* refuſed to obey ſuch a *Mandate*, and ſtill denied Communion to *Arius* and his Adherents. Nor did the *Euſebians*, who ſecretly favour'd *Arius* and his Cauſe, and for that Reaſon bore a deadly Hatred to *Athanaſius*, and had at that time a great Intereſt with *Conſtantine*, pretend to ſay, that *Athanaſius* had not a Right to judge in this Caſe, notwithſtanding the Orders of the Emperor, or to make his Refuſal of Communion to *Arius* after thoſe Orders, a Matter of Accuſation, however they might uſe it as a Motive to incenſe the Emperor againſt him. But though they reſolved to depoſe him, and get him baniſh'd, they were forced to frame Accuſations againſt him of another Nature, ſuch as his demanding Tribute to be paid by other Churches to his Church of *Alexandria*, his Breaking a Communion Chalice, Burning Sacred Books, Cutting off a Man's Hand, Stopping Corn which was going from *Alexandria* to *Conſtantinople*, Matters which belonged to the Cognizance of the Civil Magiſtrate. And for theſe things, (though falſly laid to his Charge, and ſufficiently diſproved by him) a Synod of Biſhops, headed by his profeſſed Enemies, was packed at *Tyre*, that might have the Pretence of a Spiritual Authority to depoſe him, and the Emperor was prevailed with to baniſh him. But his Refuſal to admit *Arius* to Communion notwithſtanding the Emperors Orders to do it, though Notorious and Publick, and ſuch as he neither could nor would have denied, was not charged upon him as an Offence; he was allowed to be the proper Judge whether that was to be done or not. But then, as he maintained his own

Right

Right and Authority with relation to the Spiritual Censure passed upon *Arius* for his Heresy, so he allowed the Emperor to be the Temporal Judge, in relation to the Worldly Punishment annexed to the same Cause, and blamed not *Constantine* for recalling him from Banishment, notwithstanding he had not in his Opinion sufficiently retracted his Error, or renounced his Heresy. Thus both *Athanasius* and *Constantine*, in their respective Spheres, judged the same Person for the same Offence; they gave different Judgments, the one Spiritual, the other Temporal, and both had their Effect. *Arius* still continued bound by the Censures of the Church, because *Athanasius* refused to absolve him; but was released from his Banishment, because *Constantine* had thought fit to recall him. The Bishop could not continue *Arius* in his Banishment, neither could the Emperor restore him to the Peace of the Church. Indeed, *Constantine*, urged by the *Eusebian* Faction, who had worked themselves into his Favour, did proceed so far as to command *Athanasius* to restore him, and to threaten him if he would not; but though *Athanasius* persisted in his Refusal, *Constantine* did not take upon him to do it himself. And afterwards, when *Arius* came to *Constantinople*, and there the *Eusebian* Party had resolved to force *Alexander*, the Bishop of that Place, to receive him; just as they were carrying him into the Church by Violence, against that Bishop's Consent, God himself was pleased to interpose, and in a miraculous Manner to vindicate the Honour of his Servant, who refused to receive that *Arch-Heretick* to Communion, though required to do it by the Emperor. For as *Arius* was triumphantly going towards the Church, attended by the *Eusebian* Faction, like Guards, through the midst of the City; insomuch that the Eyes of all People were upon him: When he came near that Place which is called *Constantine*'s *Forum*, where the Pillar

Pillar of Porphyric ſtood, a conſcious Terror, accompanied with a Looſeneſs, ſeized *Arius* himſelf; hereupon, he enquired for an Houſe-of-Office, and being told there was one behind *Conſtantine*'s *Forum*, he retired thither. A Fainting-fitt ſeized him, and together with his Excrements, his Fundament alſo fell down, and a great Flux of Blood followed, and his Small Guts and Blood guſhed out, together with his Spleen and Livor; whereupon he immediately died. Thus, whilſt the Emperor acted only in his own Sphere, and judged as a Temporal Magiſtrate, whether *Arius* ought to be continued in his Baniſhment or not, though it was for a Spiritual Crime, the Biſhops made no Oppoſition; but when he broke thoſe Bounds, and took upon him to determine that *Arius* ought to be received into the Communion of the Church, and though he would not pretend that it belonged to him to abſolve him, yet attempted to oblige the Biſhop to do it by Secular Force; then God thought fit to interpoſe, and by inflicting a moſt ſignal Judgment upon *Arius* himſelf, who had been the prime Cauſe of all theſe Diſturbances, ſhewed that the Biſhop, and not the Emperor, was the proper Judge whom he ſhould admit into the Communion of the Church. Thus then we ſee, how *the Emperor or King is Supreme Governor in all Cauſes, as well Spiritual as Temporal*; that is, his Power, in what Cauſe ſoever, is only Civil or Temporal, and he can only determine whether that Perſon, whoſe Cauſe he tries, deſerves to be puniſhed with the Civil Sword or not, which is all the Power, that according to the Declaration in our own Articles, our Kings challenge to themſelves, *viz. to puniſh, with the* Civil Sword, *the ſtubborn and Evil-doers*, of what Nature ſoever the Cauſe be, whether Spiritual or Temporal.

§ XVIII.

§ XVIII. And this Right of Princes to judge, with relation to *Spiritual Cauſes*, in a Civil Manner, that is, to judge whether they deſerve a Civil Puniſhment or a Civil Encouragement, is not peculiar to *Chriſtian Princes*, but is the undoubted Right of all Sovereigns whatſoever, and whatſoever Religion they are of; and was allowed to be ſo even by the Apoſtles themſelves. Thus (z) when S. *Paul* was carried before *Felix* the *Roman* Governor, and afterwards before *Feſtus*, though he was called in Queſtion concerning an Article of Faith, even the *Reſurrection of Chriſt*, (which was certainly a Spiritual Cauſe) yet the Event of the Tryal being only to have the Governor's Judgment whether he ſhould be kept in Bonds and receive farther Puniſhment, or whether he ſhould be releaſed; he made no Exceptions to the Juriſdiction, but acknowledged that he ſtood at *Cæſar's Judgment Seat*, *where he ought to be judged*, and therefore readily anſwer'd for himſelf, and gave an Account how, and in what manner he was called to his Apoſtleſhip by a Voice from Heaven, and how God had ſent him to preach that Doctrine; and appealed to *Cæſar* himſelf to determine whether he deſerved a Temporal Penalty for doing that which a greater than *Cæſar* had commiſſioned him to do. It is true, *Felix* acted the Part of an unjuſt Judge in not releaſing him, but leaving him in Bonds to pleaſe the *Jews*; yet foraſmuch as he did releaſe him, and his Succeſſor *Feſtus* ſeemed inclinable to tread in his Steps, to curry Favour with the *Jews*, S. *Paul* did not pretend to have any Authority to releaſe himſelf by his Spiritual Power, or to require thoſe who were under his Spiritual Government to take up Arms to deliver him out of Priſon, but made his

(z) Act. xxiv. xxv. xxvi.

Appeal

Appeal to *Cæsar*, as the Supreme Judge, who ought to determine concerning all Temporal Punishments, for what Cause soever to be inflicted. But which way soever *Cæsar* judged in that Matter, his Decree could have only a Civil Temporal Effect; he had it in his Power to keep S. *Paul* a Prisoner if he thought fit, or to put him to Death, or to enlarge him; the Apostle was in his Hands, and as he was his Subject could not employ the Civil Sword against him: But all this had no Effect upon S. *Paul*'s Spiritual Power; he was nevertheless an Apostle of *Jesus Christ*, his Preaching, his Ministration of the Sacraments, his Spiritual Censures, his Episcopal or Apostolical Letters, which he wrote, during his Imprisonment, to divers Churches or single Persons, were of as full Authority, as if he had been at large, and *Cæsar* himself had protected and encouraged him in the Performance of those Ministrations.

Princes ought to be very tender and careful how they take upon them to judge about Temporal Punishments for *Spiritual Causes*; for if they give a wrong Judgment, and condemn those whom *Christ* has sent to act in his Name, that is, if they inflict Temporal Penalties on them for exercising their Spiritual Power, according to the Commission they have received from our Blessed Saviour, they will be found to fight against God: And though those Bishops and Pastors, or other good Christians who suffer under them, are barred from lifting up an Hand against them to avenge themselves; yet God will not fail to take Vengeance of them in some other Way, as he did of *Nero*, *Domitian*, *Decius*, *Diocletian*, *Galerius*, *Maximin*, *Licinius*, *Julian*, and others that raised a Persecution against his Church.

§ XIX. It may perhaps be said, that according to our Laws Appeals may be made from the Bishop to the Archbishop, and from him to the King in his High

High Court of Chancery, who ſhall appoint Delegates to re-examine the Matter, though the Cauſe be purely Spiritual, and that Determination ſhall be final. Conſequently, the King is *Supreme Spiritual Judge*, as well as *Temporal*; for this Court may reverſe even the *Spiritual Judgment* of *Excommunication*. To this it may be anſwered, that our Laws having annex'd a Temporal Penalty to the Sentence of Excommunication pronounced by the Spiritual Judge, it is but reaſonable, that the King ſhould enquire into the Cauſe for which he is to inflict a Temporal Puniſhment, and to ſatisfy himſelf in the Juſtice of the Proceedings. The Judgment of the Court of *Delegates* is therefore expedient and reaſonable to ſatisfy the Prince, whether he ſhall proceed to fine, impriſon, or outlaw the Perſon whom the Church has cenſured; becauſe thoſe are Puniſhments which he and only he can execute, nor has the Spiritual Judge any Authority to require him to execute any of them, but as he ſees it fit himſelf. But I do not conceive, that this Court can ſo take off the Cenſure in a pure Spiritual Cauſe, as to reſtore a Perſon to the Communion of the Church, whether the Biſhop will or not. Yet whatever they may do *in Foro Externo*, where the Civil Magiſtrate bears the Sword, and will do what he pleaſes, ſuch a Determination proceeding only from the Prince in a Matter of which God has not made him the Judge, cannot bind *in Foro Interno*, or give Satisfaction to the Conſcience. Neither is it my Purpoſe upon this Occaſion to vindicate all the Laws of this Realm, or to ſhew that any of them are not agreeable to the Laws of God. Whatever they are, private Perſons (and ſuch are even the chief Spiritual Governors with relation to the State) muſt ſubmit to them actively or paſſively: Where they are not contrary to the Law of God, or to that Authority which is derived from Chriſt alone as Sole Head of his Church, we ought to yield an entire

entire active Obedience to them: But where they are contrary to the Law of God, or to the Authority of *Jesus Christ*, we must, as we shall be thereto called, bear our Testimony against them, and obey God and his Christ rather than Man: Though at the same time, as becomes Martyrs and Confessors, we dare not lift up an Hand against the Authority, by which that Law is made or executed, but must chearfully submit to the Temporal Penalty it lays us under. For what is it to be a Martyr or Confessor, but to bear Testimony to the Truths of the Gospel against any Humane Law or Force opposing them, and at the same time patiently to suffer the Penalty which that Law or Force shall lay us under? And this would be our Duty, upon Supposition that any of our Laws were *Erastian*, when such Laws should be put in Execution against us.

§ XX. But farther, by the Doctrine of the Book of *Homilies*, which, by Act of Parliament, is made the Law of the Land, if any Humane Law be opposite to the Law of God, it is not to be obey'd. Therefore, in particular, even by our Laws, if there be any Law of the Land which is repugnant to the Law of God, it is not to be obeyed. For, *in the second Part of the Sermon of Good Works*, the following Doctrine is taught. *This Arrogancy God detected, that Man should so advance his Laws, to make them equal with God's Laws, wherein the true Honouring and Worshipping of God standeth, and to make his Laws for them to be left off. God hath appointed his Laws, wherein his Pleasure is to be honoured: His Pleasure is also, That all Mens Laws, not being contrary unto his Laws, shall be obeyed, and kept as good and necessary for every Commonwealth; but not as Things wherein principally his Honour resteth, and all Civil or Man's Laws either be or should be made, to bring Men better to keep God's Laws, that, consequently or followingly, God should be the better honoured*

*noured by them.* Therefore, if I ſhew that *Spiritual Governors* have a Juriſdiction or Authority committed to their Truſt by the Law of God, (which being a Truſt, cannot by them be alienated to the *Civil Powers*) in proving this, I alſo at the ſame time prove it to be the Law of this Realm. But the Law of this Realm has not only thus declared that *the Law of God is above all Humane Laws whatſoever*; but has alſo particularly declared, that the Church has a *Spiritual Power* and *Authority* within itſelf, which it may exerciſe even over the greateſt Perſons themſelves, Kings or Emperors not excepted: And conſequently muſt be ſuch a Power as is not derived from the Civil Magiſtrate; for a Power derived from the Magiſtrate cannot be exerciſed over him from whom it is derived. Thus *in the ſecond Part of the Sermon of the Right Uſe of the Church*, after the mentioning our Saviour's Whipping the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple, this Doctrine is declared to reſult from it: *According to this Example of our Saviour, in the Primitive Church, which was moſt Holy and Godly, and in which due Diſcipline with Severity was uſed againſt the Wicked; open Offenders were not ſuffered once to enter into the Houſe of the Lord, nor admitted to Common-prayer, and the Uſe of the Holy Sacraments with other true Chriſtians, until they had done open Penance before the whole Church*; and this was practiſed, not only upon mean Perſons, but upon the Rich, Noble, and Mighty Perſons; yea, upon Theodoſius, that Puiſſant and Mighty Emperor, *whom for committing a grievous and wilful Murder, S.* Ambroſe *Biſhop of* Milan *reproved ſharply, and did alſo Excommunicate the ſaid Emperor, and brought him to open Penance; and they that were ſo juſtly exempted and baniſhed (as it were) from the Houſe of the Lord, were taken (as they be indeed) for Men divided and ſeparated from Chriſt's Church, and in moſt dangerous Eſtate; yea, as* S. Paul *ſaith, even given*

*unto*

*unto Satan the Devil for a time, and their Company was ſhunned and avoided of all godly Men and Women, until ſuch time as they, by Repentance and Publick Penance, were reconciled.* That is, all godly Men and Women ſhunned Communion with them as with *Chriſtians*, but the Cenſures of the Church were never ſuppoſed to make void any Natural or Civil Relations. And *Theodoſius* the Emperor, whilſt he was excluded from Communion by S. *Ambroſe*, exerciſed his whole Imperial Authority, as he did before or after; neither his Council, nor any of his Subjects declined his Company in any Civil Senſe, but reſorted to him, and receiv'd his Directions and Commands in the ſame Manner as they had been wont to do; he was only kept from the Publick Prayers and Sacraments of the Church, and was not permitted to aſſociate with the Godly Chriſtians, when they met to celebrate Divine Offices. I thought proper to make this Obſervation, becauſe the Adverſaries to the Independency of the Church generally miſrepreſent this Church-Cenſure of Excommunication, as if it deprived Men of their Civil Rights, or pretended to hinder other Perſons from performing thoſe Duties to the Perſon excommunicated, which he might claim from them by any Natural or Civil Right. For the Spiritual Cenſure affects not any Natural or Civil Rights, and if any of thoſe are affected by it according to our Conſtitution, that flows purely from the Law of the State, and therefore the Civil Magiſtrate is allow'd to be the proper Judge how far any Civil Rights ſhall be affected by it. Conſequently, whenever ſuch a Spiritual Cenſure is executed on a Supreme Magiſtrate, as it was on the Emperor *Theodoſius*, they can have no other than a pure Spiritual Effect: As indeed it can have upon no other Perſon whatſoever, otherwiſe than the Civil Laws, of which the Magiſtrate is the Judge, may annex Temporal Penalties to it.

§ XXI. And not only our *Homilies*, whoſe Doctrine, as I have ſhewed, is the Law of the Land confirm'd by Statute as well as the Doctrine of this Church, eſtabliſh'd by the Biſhops and Clergy in Synod or Convocation, aſſert the pure Spiritual Powers of the Church Independent on the Civil Powers, and that it may be exerciſed even upon the greateſt Perſons; but the ſame is owned even in the Body of an Act of Parliament, where both Lords and Commons have acknowledged, that neither they nor the King claimed any Spiritual Power, but only a Civil Power. (*a*) Thus when an Act was made by King *Henry* VIII (when the Regal Authority in Spiritual Matters was ſtretched to the height) *concerning Peter-pence and Diſpenſations*, it was in expreſs Terms *provided, That this Act, nor any Thing or Things therein contained, ſhall not be hereafter interpreted or expounded*, that your Grace, your Nobles and Subjects, *intend by the ſame to decline or vary from the Congregation of Chriſt's Church, in any Things concerning the very Articles of the Catholick Faith of* Chriſtendom, or in any other Things declared by Holy Scripture and the Word of God, neceſſary for your and their Salvations; *but only to make an Ordinance, by Policies neceſſary and convenient, to repreſs Vice, and for the good Conſervation of the Realms in Peace, Unity and Tranquility, from Ravin and Spoil, enſuing much the old, ancient Cuſtoms of this Realm in that Behalf, not minding to ſeek for any Relief, Succours, or Remedies for any* Worldly Things, *but, within this Realm, at the Hands of your Highneſs, your Heirs and Succeſſors, Kings of this Realm; which have and ought to have an* Imperial *Power and Authority in the ſame, and not obliged in any* Worldly Cauſes *to any Superior.* Here I think it is evident, that

(*a*) 25 *Hen.* 8. *Cap.* 21. §. 19.

the

the King, Lords and Commons, the whole Legiſlative as well as Executive Power of this Realm, claims no Authority in other than *in Worldly Things or Cauſes*, and that they would not have the Act which they then made to be interpreted or expounded to intend more, conſequently they diſclaimed all Judicature *in Spiritual Things and Cauſes*, where *Worldly Things and Cauſes* are not affected by them: As indeed they are not, by ſuch Matters wherein the Church juſtly claims a Juriſdiction as derived from Chriſt. For the Spiritual Power which is claimed by the Church, affects only thoſe Matters which concern *Articles of the Catholick Faith of Chriſtendom and other Things declared by the Holy Scripture and the Word of God to be neceſſary to Salvation*: Which Things are in this Act diſclaimed by the Civil Power; and they will not have any thing decreed by them to be interpreted or expounded to intend any ſuch Thing. And though the ſame is not declared in all other Acts which concern Religion or Religious Perſons, yet being thus diſclaimed in this Act, which remains to this Day unrepealed, it is plainly implied in all others: And proves, that the Supreme Power of this Realm claims no other than a Civil Authority over all Perſons with relation to all Cauſes, and a Right to judge when and where Civil Penalties ſhall be inflicted, and as it is expreſſed in the Thirty ſeventh Article (confirm'd alſo by Act of Parliament) *to reſtrain with the* Civil Sword *the ſtubborn and evil Doers.* And this Civil Authority of the Magiſtrate is and was always allowed to belong to him, and to him only, whether he was Heathen or Chriſtian. Our Saviour and his Apoſtles ſubmitted to it, neither did they deny his Juriſdiction to judge whether they had done any thing which might deſerve Death or Bonds, or any other Temporal Penalty. And ſo alſo did the Primitive Chriſtians under the Heathen Emperors. They complain indeed of the Unrighte-

ouſneſs of the Judgments given againſt them, but never deny'd or excepted againſt the Juriſdiction of their Judges. But it is only the Civil Authority of the Magiſtrate was allowed or acknowledged in thoſe Days, all Spiritual Power under *Chriſt* was then believed and owned to be in the Biſhops and Paſtors of the Church; nor did the Emperor pretend to it. And as no Subjects of the State were more obedient to Kings and Temporal Magiſtrates, ſo no Subjects of the Church were ever more obedient to their Spiritual Governors than the Primitive Chriſtians, having both the Example and Precept of *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles for this double Obedience.

§ XXII. Our Bleſſed Saviour, though he renounced all Civil Power, as has been already obſerved, and was himſelf ſubject to it, yet exerciſed his Spiritual Authority without asking any Licence from the Civil Magiſtrate on that Occaſion, made and baptized Multitudes of Diſciples, and out of them choſe twelve Apoſtles, and after that ſeventy others whom he ſent to preach the Goſpel and bring more into his Church, and commanded Obedience to them, ſaying, (c) *He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me; and he that deſpiſeth me, deſpiſeth him that ſent me.* And he alſo threatens the ſevereſt Judgments to thoſe that ſhall be diſobedient and not hearken to thoſe ſent by him, ſaying, (d) *whoſoever ſhall not receive you and hear your Words, when ye depart out of that Houſe or City, ſhake off the Duſt of your Feet. Verily I ſay unto you, it ſhall be more tolerable for the Land of* Sodom *and* Gomorrha *in the Day of Judgment, than for that City.* St. *Paul* alſo, though he acknowledged the Magiſtrates Civil Juriſdiction and his Authority to judge, whether he would inflict a Temporal Penalty on him or not, yet claimed a Spi-

(c) *Luke* x, 16. (d) *Mat.* x. 14, 15.

ritual

ritual Jurisdiction to himself as derived from *Christ* and independent on the Magistrate, and by virtue of this Authority he threatens the (*e*) *Corinthians*, and asks them *if they will that he shall come unto them with a Rod, or in Love and the Spirit of Meekness.* And tells them also, that he (*f*) *writes these things being absent, lest being present he should use Sharpness, according to the Power which the Lord had given him to Edification and not to Destruction.* Here he plainly claims a *Power*, not given him by the Civil Magistrate, but by *the Lord*, that is, by *Christ.* And his Precepts were also agreeable to his Practice: For as in the thirteenth Chapter to the *Romans* he very strictly enjoins Obedience to the Civil Magistrate, so in other Places he enjoins Obedience to the Spiritual Governors, saying, (*g*) *Know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and esteem them very highly in Love for their Works sake.* (*h*) *Remember them which have the Rule over you, who have spoken unto you the Word of God: whose Faith follow, considering the End of their Conversation. Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit yourselves: For they watch four your Souls, as they that must give Account: That they may do it with Joy, and not with Grief; for that is unprofitable for you.* And he himself, by virtue of his Authority received from *Christ*, appointed these *Spiritual Rulers*, without asking the Civil Magistrates Commission for it, (*i*) *ordaining Elders in every Church.* And not only did this himself, but commissioned others to do the same, as we learn from his Words to *Titus*, to whom he says, (*k*) *For this Cause left I thee in* Crete, *that thou shouldst set in Order the Things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I*

(*e*) 1 *Cor.* iv. 21. (*f*) 2 *Cor.* xiii. 10. (*g*) 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. (*h*) *Heb.* xiii. 7. 17. (*i*) *Act.* xiv. 23. (*k*) *Tit.* i. 5.

*appointed thee.* Therefore, for Men to ſay, that there cannot be two Independent Powers, the one Spiritual and the other Temporal in the ſame Place; and that the ſame Perſon cannot be ſubject to one Man in Spirituals and to another in Temporals, is directly contrary both to our Saviour's Doctrine and Practice, and to that of his Apoſtles alſo, and is confuted by plain Facts teſtified by the Holy Scriptures. And Matter of Fact is a ſenſible Demonſtration. And therefore they muſt either deny the Fact, they muſt deny the Scriptures and Chriſtianity itſelf, or muſt grant that two Independent Powers, the one Spiritual, and the other Temporal, may exiſt at the ſame Time and in the ſame Place, and be exerciſed over the ſame Perſons: For we have the ſame Evidence for this that we have for Chriſtianity itſelf. Neither is it in any Reſpect contrary to Reaſon: For what ſhould hinder but the ſame Man may be ſubject to his Biſhop and his King at the ſame Time, and when guilty of an Offence, liable to be puniſhed by both, by his King corporally, and his Biſhop ſpiritually? Thus for Inſtance, Suppoſe a Man is guilty of Theft: He may and ought to be puniſh'd in the King's Courts according as the Law in that Caſe ſhall direct; but this does not hinder but that he may and ought alſo to receive a Spiritual Correction from his Paſtor, to be reproved, rebuked and exhorted by him, and to be denied the Benefit of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, till he give ſufficient Teſtimonies of his ſincere Repentance; nay, his Paſtor ought to treat him in that Manner even though he ſhould be pardoned by the Prince. And I conceive it muſt be manifeſt to every Body that ſuch Proceeding of the Paſtor no way impedes or interferes with the Prince's Authority: For if the Prince ſees it fit to puniſh ſuch an Offender according to the utmoſt Severity of the Laws, and the Paſtor at the ſame time ſees it convenient, upon due Teſtimonies given of ſincere Repentance,

to

to declare and pronounce to him the Pardon and Remiſſion of his Sins, and to ſign and ſeal that Pardon by communicating to him the Repreſentative Body and Blood of *Chriſt*; or if the Magiſtrate ſhall ſee it expedient entirely to pardon the Offence, and to reſtore him to all the Rights and Privileges he before enjoy'd; but at the ſame time the Paſtor thinks it proper to deny him the Abſolution of the Church, and to admit him to the Participation of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, becauſe he has not ſeen ſuch due Teſtimonies of Repentance as he judges to be neceſſary on ſuch an Occaſion, both Powers, Spiritual and Temporal, are then duly exerciſed on the ſame Perſon and in the ſame Cauſe, and yet one does not at all interfere with the other. Such Proceeding as this can raiſe no Diſſention between the Spiritual and Temporal Powers, whilſt they are both thus kept within their proper Bounds. But if the Temporal Magiſtrate will alſo pretend to a Spiritual Power, and becauſe he ſees it expedient to pardon the Malefactor the Temporal Puniſhment due to his Crimes, ſhall therefore judge and determine that his Spiritual Governor muſt alſo give him the Abſolution of the Church, and adminiſter the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* to him as a Seal of that Abſolution, or ſhall either pretend to give ſuch Abſolution himſelf, or to force the Spiritual Governor to do it, or perſecute him for his Refuſal; Or if on the other hand the Spiritual Governor, becauſe he ſees the Man has given due Teſtimonies of his Repentance, and for that Reaſon judges it fit to give him the full Abſolution of the Church, ſhall therefore require the Magiſtrate to remit the Temporal Puniſhment due to ſuch Crimes, or ſhall either pretend himſelf to pardon ſuch Temporal Puniſhment, or to oblige the Magiſtrate to do it by threatning him with Spiritual Cenſures, if he refuſes; in ſuch a Caſe indeed the two Powers will plainly interfere with each other. But the Cauſe of

this is not that the two Powers cannot exiſt independent on each other; but becauſe thoſe who have the Exerciſe of theſe two Powers are not contented with the Boundaries ſet to each Power, but will make Encroachments one upon the other: Whereas when each keeps within his proper Bounds, they may, and will not only exiſt very well together, but will mutually preſerve and ſupport each other. Thus the Spiritual Governors will ſupport the Civil Magiſtrate by teaching the ſeveral Flocks committed to their Charge the Principles of Loyalty and Obedience, and enforcing the Practice of them by threatning the Penalty of Damnation: And the Civil Magiſtrate will ſupport and protect the Church by making Laws in its Favour, and corroborating her Decrees and Canons by his Temporal Authority. But if the Magiſtrate will exerciſe a Spiritual Power, and take upon him to miniſter the Word and Sacraments, and to judge when and to whom they ſhall be miniſtred; or the Spiritual Governors ſhall challenge a Temporal Power independent on the Magiſtrate, and pretend to judge and determine when Civil Penalties ſhall be inflicted; then indeed two Independent Powers acting in ſuch Manner will not ſubſiſt tagether, without frequent Contentions; but theſe Conteſts cannot ariſe from the Powers themſelves, but from the Uſurpations of one Power upon the other; for, let each keep within the Bounds of his own Power, and not uſurp upon the other, and there will be no interfering.

§ XXIII. Again, as theſe two Powers are thus plainly diſtinct, and may very well exiſt together independent of each other in the Exerciſe of their ſeveral Powers on the ſame Perſon and in the ſame Cauſes, and were plainly ſo deſigned to be by our Saviour, ſo alſo are they independent with regard to the granting Spiritual or Temporal Commiſſions. For as a Biſhop can give no Temporal Commiſſion, or

autho-

authorize any Perſon to execute a Temporal Office; ſo neither can the Civil Magiſtrate give a Spiritual Commiſſion, or ordain any Perſon to a Spiritual Office in the Church: And as they cannot give, ſo neither can they deprive any one of ſuch Office as it belongs not to them to beſtow. The Civil Magiſtrate can no more take away the Office of a *Biſhop*, *Prieſt* or *Deacon*, than any one of thoſe can deprive him of his Office. *Feſtus* had certainly no more Power or lawful Authority to deprive St. *Paul* of his Apoſtleſhip, than St. *Paul* had to deprive him of his Preſidency of *Judea*: Neither had *Feſtus* any more Power to make St. *Paul* an Apoſtle, than St. *Paul* had to make him a Preſident or Procurator of a Province. And as the Magiſtrate cannot give or take away a Spiritual Office, ſo neither can he forbid a Spiritual Officer the Exerciſe of his Office; (*l*) for when the *Sanhedrim* of the *Jews* called the Apoſtles, *Peter* and *John*, before them, and forbad them the Exerciſe of their Apoſtleſhip, *and commanded them not to ſpeak at all, nor teach in the Name of* Jeſus, Peter *and* John *anſwered and ſaid unto them, Whether it be right in the Sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.* And again, when they were taken up (*m*) and examined, why they had not obeyed this Command, *Then* Peter *and the other Apoſtles anſwered and ſaid, We ought to obey God rather than Men.* And though (*n*) they were beaten for this Anſwer, and again *commanded, that they ſhould not ſpeak in the Name of* Jeſus; yet they judged it their Duty not to obey in this Caſe, *And they departed from the Preſence of the Council, rejoycing that they were counted worthy to ſuffer Shame for his Name. And daily in the Temple and in every Houſe they ceaſed not to teach and preach* Jeſus Chriſt. Nor let it be ſaid, that though the Apoſtles might thus exerciſe their Commiſſion,

(l) *Act.* iv. 18, 19. (m) *Act.* v. 29. (n) *Act.* v. 40, 41, 42.

though

though forbidden by the Civil Power, yet it does not follow, that other Ministers of the Gospel may do the same, because the Apostles were immediately sent by *Christ* himself; but those who come after them are not so sent. For the Commission which *Christ* gave to his Apostles was not Personal to them only, but to them and their Successors, as appears from the very Commission itself, wherein (*o*) he promises to be *with them alway, even to the end of the World.* What *Christ* therefore committed to them, the same did they commit to others, giving them Commandment to commit the same to others also after them in a continued Succession. Thus particularly St. *Paul* (*p*) *committed this Charge to his Son* Timothy, and commanded him to *give Attendance to reading, to Exhortation and to Doctrine, not to neglect the Gift that was in him, which was given him by Prophecy with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery.* And likewise directs him to give the same Commission to others, saying, (*q*) *The Things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also.* And Ecclesiastical History shews, that these Successors of the Apostles were forbidden the Exercise of their Ministry as well as the Apostles themselves had been; and yet that they did not forbear to preach and teach in the Name of *Christ*, and to minister his Sacraments and execute his Discipline, notwithstanding those Prohibitions. A sure Argument, that they did not think the Civil Magistrate had any Authority either to deprive them of their Ministry, or to forbid the Exercise of it: For they endured ten severe Persecutions, rather than submit to such Civil Deprivations and Prohibitions; and God shewed his Approbation of their Conduct in this Matter, not only by giving them Grace and Strength to suffer the

(*o*) *Mat.* xxviii. 20.
(*p*) 1 *Tim.* i. 18. *and* iv. 13, 14. (*q*) 2 *Tim.* ii. 2.

greatest

greateſt Tortures for his Name's ſake, with a moſt undaunted Courage and Conſtancy, but alſo enabling them to work Miracles, and to conquer by their Sufferings: So that inſtead of being ſuppreſſed and quelled by theſe violent Perſecutions, they increaſed and multiplied till they had brought even their Enemies into the Church, and thoſe that moſt hated and perſecuted them became their great Friends and Protectors.

§ XXIV. Indeed after the Empire was come into the Church, and Princes and States had given large Endowments to it, and had veſted the Biſhops with many Civil Privileges, then indeed they thought it proper to know before-hand on whom ſuch Privileges ſhould be beſtowed, and took upon them to nominate or recommend fit Perſons to thoſe Biſhopricks they had endowed, as others of the Laity alſo nominated or recommended a fit Perſon to be made the Miniſter or Prieſt of ſuch a Pariſh-Church as he had endowed with Manſe and Glebe. But as the Patron of a Pariſh Church never pretended to give his Clerk whom he nominated, or preſented to a Parochial Cure, a Spiritual Commiſſion, or to veſt him with the Cure of Souls, or give him the Orders of Prieſthood; ſo when a Prince or State nominated or recommended a Perſon to a Biſhoprick, they never pretended to make him a Biſhop, but only preſented him to the Biſhops as one whom they judged a fit Perſon to be advanced to ſuch an Office. But in one Caſe as well as the other, if the Biſhop or Biſhops to whom ſuch Perſon was recommended or nominated to be made a Prieſt or a Biſhop, did not ſee fit to ordain or conſecrate him to that Office, the Patron, King or State did not pretend to make him a Prieſt or Biſhop notwithſtanding. And as we have many Inſtances of a Biſhop's refuſing to ordain a Man Prieſt, who has been recommended or nominated by a Patron to a Parochial Cure, ſo we want

not

not Instances of Persons who have been nominated to Bishopricks by Sovereign Princes whom the Metropolitan and College of Bishops have refused to consecrate; and he that has been so refused was forced to continue what he was before; the Prince could not make him a Bishop. But although Recommendation or Nomination will not make a Bishop or Priest without Consecration or Ordination, yet Consecration or Ordination will make a Priest or Bishop without any Recommendation or Nomination; and Priests are to this Day frequently made so; and so were Bishops also in the Primitive Church both before and after the Empire became Christian; Christian Princes having no more Right to grant a Spiritual Power or Commission than an Heathen Emperor. But any Prince, whether Christian or Infidel, may recommend or nominate a Man to be made a a Priest or a Bishop, and there is no Harm in the Bishops accepting and ordaining him, if they find him qualified for the Office. But then it is not the Prince, but the Metropolitan or the College of Bishops that makes such Person a Bishop. Sovereign Princes, whatever they be, will have that Influence over Bishops, their Subjects, that they will not lightly refuse what they ask of them; and upon this Account when Sovereign Princes had obliged their Bishops by their liberal Endowments of the Church, the Bishops would not lightly refuse to consecrate whomsoever they recommended or nominated to them. And when such Nomination was become a Custom, then Princes began to challenge it as their undoubted Right: And the Bishops having so long complied with it, knew not at last how to recede from it. And at this time, as our Laws now stand, they cannot recede from it without incurring a grievous Temporal Penalty.

§ XXV.

§ XXV. However, though Biſhops are now thus nominated by the Temporal Magiſtrate, yet foraſmuch as ſuch Nomination neither does nor can make them Biſhops, but they are ſo made by a regular Conſecration or Ordination, as appears from what has been already ſaid, and alſo from the very Form of Conſecration in our Liturgy, where the Archbiſhop ſays to the Perſon to be conſecrated, *Receive the Holy Ghoſt for the Office and Work of a Biſhop in the Church of God*, now *committed unto thee* by the Impoſition of our Hands, it is evident, that our Biſhops have the ſame Spiritual Power which the Apoſtles and Primitive Biſhops had, and hold it Independent on the Civil Magiſtrate, without deriving any part of it from him. His Epiſcopal Office and his Spiritual Relation to his Flock are ſtill conferred upon him by the Spiritual Governors of the Church. The Metropolitan, as Head of the Epiſcopal College, or four Biſhops, in caſe there be no Metropolitan, confirm the Perſon nominated and elected, and thereby give him the Spiritual Government of that See to which they ſo appoint him by that Confirmation; and if he have not been conſecrated before, they alſo then conſecrate him to the Epiſcopal Office. Thus every Biſhop of our Church receives all his Spiritual Power and his Spiritual Relation to his Flock from the Spiritual Governors of the Church only: For without this be done by them all, the Temporal Powers of the World are not able to veſt him with a Spiritual Authority over any People whatſoever. They may recommend, they may nominate, and whether the Biſhops will conſecrate him or not, if they are reſolv'd to ſtretch and abuſe their Power, they have Strength to put him in Poſſeſſion of the Epiſcopal Houſe; nay, and the Cathedral or Epiſcopal Church too; they can fine, impriſon, or even put to Death the Biſhops who have refuſed to confirm and

conſecrate

conſecrate him; but all this cannot make him a Biſhop, or give him any Spiritual Authority over the People they would have to be committed to his Charge. The People would lie under no Obligation to receive the Word and Sacraments at his Hands, or at the Hands of any that ſhould pretend to be his Presbyters: Nay, if ſuch pretended Biſhop or any Presbyters pretendedly ordain'd by him, ſhould preſume to miniſter the Word and Sacraments, they would be guilty of the higheſt Profanation of theſe Divine Ordinances: And the People which knowingly receive them at their Hands would reap only a Curſe and not a Bleſſing from them. And therefore even King *Henry* VIII. who would be called Supreme Head of the Church, (r) (*a Name*, which his Daughter *Elizabeth* declar'd, *could not be given to any mortal Man*, and therefore refuſed herſelf to be ſo called) never pretended (as has been already obſerved) to make a Biſhop himſelf, if the Biſhops ſhould refuſe to conſecrate him. All that he thought himſelf capable of doing in that Caſe was to puniſh the Biſhops who ſhould refuſe the Man he or his Succeſſors ſhould nominate. It is true this is a great Stretch of the Temporal Power, and ſuch as former Ages have no Precedent for; but ſtill it gives no Spiritual Power to the King: For if all the Biſhops ſhould ever have the Courage to face a *Præmunire*, upon the Nomination of an unworthy Perſon to a Biſhoprick, all the Power of the King-

(r) Regina non vult appellari aut ſcribi, Caput Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ: graviter enim reſpondit, illam dignitatem ſoli eſſe attributam Chriſto: *nemini autem mortalium convenire. See a Letter of Biſhop* Suell's *to* Bullinger, *dated* May 22, 1559. *that is in the firſt Year of Queen* Elizabeth, *publiſh'd by Biſhop* Burnet *in the* 3*d Volume of his Hiſtory among the Records, Book* 6. *Num.* 48. *And by* Strype *in his Appendix to his Hiſtory of the Reformation, Num.* 20.

dom

dom cannot make him a Biſhop. And if the Biſhops who refuſe to conſecrate ſuch a Perſon ſhould ſuffer the Penalty of the Laws for ſo doing, they would ſuffer not as diſobedient rebellious Subjects, but as Confeſſors or Martyrs. And the Prince who ſhould execute this Law upon them in ſuch a Caſe where the Perſon nominated was apparently unworthy or unqualified for the Office, would be a Perſecutor of the Church of God: And though no Power in this World could call him to an Account for it (for the Apoſtles and Primitive Chriſtians never pretended they could depoſe an Emperor becauſe he perſecuted them) yet he would be liable to the juſt Vengeance of God, and anſwer for it in the other World. But if the Perſon be worthy or well qualify'd for the Office of a Biſhop, the Nomination of the Prince can by no means make him leſs worthy or leſs fit for that Office. And therefore ſo long as Princes name only thoſe that are worthy and qualified (though poſſibly others might be found more worthy or better qualified) it is no Fault in the Biſhops to receive and conſecrate them, and ſo to commit the Spiritual Power to them.

§ XXVI. And as it is thus evident that a Prince or Civil Magiſtrate can give no Spiritual Power to a Biſhop, or veſt him with the Spiritual Care of a Dioceſe or Biſhoprick, but he muſt receive that Power from the Biſhops of the Church; ſo it is no leſs evident that when he is veſted with ſuch a Power he cannot deprive him of it, or take it from him during his Life. His Authority will be the ſame as to all Spiritual Matters, and his Spiritual Acts as valid after any ſuch pretended Deprivation as they were before it: And the People which were committed to his Charge by the Authority of the Epiſcopal College will be as much obliged to acknowledge him for their chief Governor in Spirituals as ever they were. Indeed

deed the Temporalties and Revenues of a Biſhoprick being outward and viſible Things, may happen in Fact to be taken from a Biſhop, even as any Man's Eſtate may happen to be taken from him, though he have never ſo good a Right to it: That is, it may be taken or detained from him by unjuſt Force and Violence. And when a Biſhop's Temporalties are ſo taken and detained, he cannot repel that unjuſt Force by any outward compulſory Method otherwiſe than by applying to the Civil Magiſtrate for his Protection and Aſſiſtance. And therefore though our Kings as Protectors and Guardians of the Church, when a Biſhoprick is vacant, take the Temporalties into their own Hands till the College of Biſhops have filled the See: Yet the Biſhop who is ſo put into that See ſues the Temporalties out of the King's Hands as of Right belonging to him: And if the King will not then deliver them to him, he is guilty of the ſame Injuſtice, at leaſt, as if he detained any other Perſon's Eſtate which of Right belonged to him. And a like Act of Injuſtice will that King be guilty of who ſhall ſeize the Temporalties of a Biſhoprick and take them into his own Poſſeſſion, or give them to another, whilſt the Biſhop to whom they were granted is living, and has a juſt Claim to them. And thus the Independency of the Church upon the State as to its pure Spiritual Powers is very plainly preſerved amongſt us, notwithſtanding that our Biſhops are nominated by the King, and uſe to receive their Temporalties or Revenues from him, and to pay him Homage for them. For though the King nominate the Perſon, and gives him the Lands and Lordſhips belonging to his See, yet it is the Metropolitan or other Biſhops only that give him his Spiritual Power and a Spiritual Juriſdiction over that Flock which they commit to his Charge. And for this Reaſon, when a Biſhop is conſecrated and appointed to his Charge, he from that time becomes

the

the Spiritual Father of his Dioceſe, and the People are obliged to receive the Word and Sacraments at his Hands and at the Hands of his Presbyters, although the King ſhould refuſe to veſt him with the Lands and Lordſhips belonging to his Biſhoprick: And the Caſe is the ſame if the King ſhould afterwards think convenient by Act of Parliament, or by a Judgment in any of his Courts to diveſt or deprive him of any or of all thoſe Lands and Lordſhips, or other Revenues which may have been ſettled on the Biſhoprick: He will ſtill continue the rightful Paſtor of that Flock, he will be the true Biſhop and Spiritual Father of that People, and they will be obliged to receive the Word and Sacraments from him and his Presbyters, and from no other in Oppoſition to him, notwithſtanding any ſuch Deprivation or Diveſtment; for the Spiritual Relation of a Paſtor to his Flock has no Dependance on his Temporal Revenues: (*s*) For though *the Lord hath ordained that they which preach the Goſpel ſhould live of the Goſpel*, yet if the Paſtor have no Maintenance from thoſe to whom he preaches the Goſpel, this does not by any means deprive him of his Spiritual Relation to his Flock. St. *Paul*, though he told the *Corinthians*, that he had ſuch a Right to a Maintenance from them, yet at the ſame time declared, that *he had uſed none of theſe Things*; that is, had received no Temporal Subſiſtence from them; but ſays he, (*t*) *I robbed other Churches, taking Wages of them, to do you Service. And when I was preſent with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no Man: For that which was lacking to me the Brethren which came from* Macedonia *ſupplied: and in all Things I have kept my ſelf from being burthenſom unto you, and ſo will I keep my ſelf.* And yet he inſiſted upon his Spiritual Relation to them as their only Father

(s) 1 *Cor.* ix. 14. (t) 2 *Cor.* xi. 8, 9.

in *Christ*, notwithstanding his receiving no Temporal Advantage by it, saying, (*u*) *Though ye have ten thousand Instructers in* Christ, *yet have ye not many Fathers: For in* Christ Jesus *I have begotten you through the Gospel. Wherefore I beseech you be ye Followers of me.* Which is an evident Proof that the Spiritual Relation a Bishop bears to his Flock has no Dependance upon the Maintenance to be receiv'd from that Flock. And that although God have given the Bishop a Right to such Maintenance, yet if he has it not, he is no less the Father of that Flock than if he had it. Consequently when a Bishop (of this Realm for Instance) is vested by the Metropolitan to whom the Spiritual Power of every vacant Diocese devolves, he from that time becomes the Spiritual Father of that Diocese, and the People are obliged to obey him in Spirituals even before the King has restored the Temporalties to him. Which is an Evidence that even according to our own Constitution the Spiritual Relation of a Bishop to his Flock has no Dependance upon the Crown, or the Civil Magistrate. They are distinct Things, and upon every Vacancy are under the Guardianship of different Powers. For as upon the Death of a Bishop the Guardianship of the Temporalties of the Bishoprick is taken by the King as the Sovereign Protector of all Worldly Things, whether they belong to the Church or the State, so the Spiritualties devolve to the Metropolitan as Head of the Episcopal College; or if there be no Metropolitan, they devolve in these latter Centuries to the *Metropolitical Chapter* as Guardians of the Spiritualties for that time. And as the Metropolitan now lays no Claim to the Guardianship of the Temporalties, so neither does the King or any other Civil Magistrate lay any Claim to the

(*u*) 1 *Cor.* iv. 15, 16.

Spiritualties.

Spiritualties of a vacant Biſhoprick. Conſequently if the King or the whole State aſſembled in Parliament, take upon them to deprive a Biſhop, ſuch Deprivation cannot affect his Spiritualties which they lay no Claim to, even in a Vacancy. It can only deprive him of their Protection as to the actual keeping the Poſſeſſion of his Temporalties: His Spiritual Relation to his Dioceſe, and his Spiritual Power over it, has another Original, being derived to him directly from *Chriſt* himſelf, and conveyed to him by Impoſition of Spiritual Hands in a regular Succeſſion. The People of that Dioceſe are ſtill obliged to adhere to him as their Spiritual Father, notwithſtanding the Temporal Magiſtrate has thought fit to take away the Revenues belonging to his See and to give them to another.

§ XXVII. It is the Apoſtle's Command, that the People ſhould know, receive and adhere to their Biſhop or chief Spiritual Father. And therefore when St. *Paul* ſent home *Epaphroditus* (*w*) the Biſhop of the *Philippians* to his Flock, he required them to *receive him in the Lord with all Gladneſs; and to hold ſuch in Reputation.* For that *Epaphroditus* was their Biſhop or chief Spiritual Governor is manifeſt from what goes before, where he ſays, *I ſuppoſed it neceſſary to ſend to you* Epaphroditus, *my Brother and Companion in Labour and Fellow-Soldier, but your Apoſtle.* For thoſe whom we now call *Biſhops* were in the firſt Age of the Church called *Apoſtles*, (*x*) as I have elſewhere proved. For it is evident from the Scriptures, that the Apoſtles were the chief Governors of the Church, as the Biſhops have been ever ſince their Times: And that not only the Twelve and St. *Paul*, who were

(*w*) *Philip* ii. 29. (*x*) *Account of Church-Government and Governors, Chap.* 4.

immediately chosen and sent by *Christ* himself, but divers others also (y) as *Barnabas*, *Epaphroditus* already mentioned, (z) *Andronicus* and *Junia*, (a) *Titus* and others. Our Translation indeed calls *Epaphroditus*, *Titus* and his Brethren, in the Places quoted, *Messengers of the Churches*, but why, or for what Reason I know not, for in the Original they are called *Apostles*, and it is the Original that is properly the Scripture or Word of God, and not our Translation where it differs from it. Now the Scripture teaches, that the *Apostles* were the chief Governors of the Church, each in his own Line, District or Diocese, as St. *Paul* teaches, who plainly claimed this chief Government in Spiritual Matters over the *Corinthians* and the other Churches which he had planted, but pretended not to the like Authority in any other Apostle's Line or District, saying, (b) *We will not boast of things without our Measure, but according to the Measure of the Rule* (or *Line*, as it is in the Margin) *which God hath destributed to us, a Measure to reach even unto you. For we stretch not our selves beyond our Measure, as though we reached not unto you: For we are come as far as to you also in preaching the Gospel of Christ: Not boasting of Things without our Measure, that is, of other Mens Labours.* From whence it appears, that each *Apostle* or chief Governor of the Church, which we now call a *Bishop*, had his proper Diocese, Rule, Line or District, in which no other might claim a Spiritual Jurisdiction independent on him: For this would be to make a *Schism* in the Church. And therefore as St. *Paul* claims a Spiritual Jurisdiction over the *Corinthians*, as within his Rule or Line, within that District which was committed to his Charge, so he challenges it exclusive of all others who pre-

(y) *Acts* xiv. 14. 1 *Cor.* ix. 5, 6. (z) *Rom.* xvi. 7.
(a) 2 *Cor.* viii. 23. (b) 2 *Cor.* x. 13, 14, 15.

tended

tended to act there independently on him. And therefore though he very well approved that *Apollos* and *Cephas*, or any ſent by them, ſhould aſſiſt him either in the Converſion or Inſtruction of the *Corinthians*, yet he could not allow that any under Pretence of being ſent by thoſe Apoſtles ſhould undertake to execute a Spiritual Power in that Diſtrict in Oppoſition to him, or to draw away the People from their Obedience to him, and encourage them to follow ſome other Spiritual Guide in Oppoſition to him. Not that *Apollos* or *Cephas*, had really themſelves done any thing in Oppoſition to St *Paul*, for they only watered what St. *Paul* had planted, and acted in Union with him as Friends and Aſſiſtants. But ſome other made uſe of the Names of thoſe Apoſtles, and pretended a Commiſſion from them to act independently on St. *Paul* within his Jurisdiction. And this was what he declared to be contrary to the Will of God, and what he could by no means allow: (*c*) *For*, ſays he, *though ye have ten thouſand Inſtructers in* Chriſt, *yet have ye not many* Fathers: *For in* Chriſt Jeſus *I have begotten you through the Goſpel. Wherefore I beſeech you be ye followers of me.* That is, be obedient and ſubject to me as your rightful Father or Spiritual Governor, for you cannot reject and caſt me off to follow other Spiritual Guides in Oppoſition to me without a grievous Sin. And then he adds, *For this Cauſe have I ſent unto you* Timotheus, *who is my beloved Son, and faithful in the Lord, who ſhall bring you into Remembrance of my Ways which be in* Chriſt, *as I teach every where in every Church.* As if he had ſaid, I have, for this Reaſon, ſent *Timothy* as my Deputy to take the Care and Charge of you under me, and inſtruct you what you ought to do till I can come my ſelf amongſt you. *Now ſome are puffed up as though I*

(*c*) 1 *Cor.* iv. 15, 16.

*would not come to you.* Some I understand have entertained an Opinion that I will come no more amongst you, and that I have abdicated my Charge; and therefore suppose they may take it upon themselves as if I had no longer any Authority over you. *But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will, and will know not the speech of them which are puffed up, but the Power.* By the Grace of God I intend to be with you in a little Time, and shall then make it my Business to enquire, not what Doctrines these Men which have acted in Opposition to me have taught, but by what Power or Authority they have taken upon them to come and act within my District independent on me the chief Spiritual Father. *For the Kingdom of God is not in Word but in Power.* For the Church of *Christ*, that Society which our Saviour has chosen out of the World to be his peculiar People, does not subsist upon Doctrines and Opinions only, it is not sufficient that Men believe such and such Things as Matters of Faith, this alone makes not a Kingdom, Corporation, City or Society of Men: For every Society or Corporation of Men, as the Kingdom of God is (otherwise it cannot be a Kingdom) must have a Power and Authority within itself derived by Commission from the Founder of the Corporation, which Commission is certainly given to me as your proper Father in *Christ*, and those that are puffed up against me are by consequence puffed up against *Christ*, whatever Doctrines they teach: Upon which Account I shall have no Occasion to examine their Doctrines, but to enquire whether they have a legal Power and Authority to act as Ministers of *Christ* within my Jurisdiction in Opposition to me; or whether they have a Commission that supersedes mine, for otherwise they are no better than Intruders and Usurpers. *What will ye? shall I come unto you with a Rod, or in Love and in the Spirit of Meekness?* Will you submit to me quietly and peaceably, or must I be forced to exercise

exerciſe that Authority amongſt you which I have received from *Chriſt*, to inflict ſuch Spiritual Cenſures as I ſhall judge you deſerve? Will ye return to your Duty by fair Means or not? Theſe Words of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, who were a Part of his Charge, very plainly ſhew, that he claimed a chief Spiritual Power over them independent on all Powers of the Earth, and that he could allow none to act there as Paſtors of that Flock, unleſs it were as his Friends and Aſſociates, or as Miniſters under him: And that he had Authority to correct ſuch as did ſo or ſided with them with Spiritual Cenſures, ſuch as ſhould exclude them from the Kingdom of God.

§ XXVIII. After this he ſhews them, that this Subordination of one Member or Miniſter of the Church to another is abſolutely neceſſary to preſerve the Union of the Body, and that whatever Spiritual Gifts or Graces one Member may have above another, yet this does not give him a new or different Station in the Body of *Chriſt* from what he had before. And this he demonſtrates by comparing the Church or Body of *Chriſt* to the natural Body of a Man, ſaying, (*d*) *As the Body is one and hath many Members, and all the Members of that one Body, being many are one Body, ſo alſo is Chriſt. For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, whether we be* Jews *or* Gentiles, *whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the Body is not one Member, but many.* Conſequently *Chriſt*, as to his Body the Church, muſt conſiſt of many Members alſo, and every Member muſt have its proper Station that it may be uſeful to the Body. Conſider therefore, *If*, in the Natural Body, *the Foot ſhall ſay, Becauſe I am*

(d) 1 *Cor.* xii. 12, 13, 14.

*not the Hand, I am not of the Body; is it therefore not of the Body? And if the Ear shall say, Because I am not the Eye, I am not of the Body; is it therefore not of the Body? If the whole Body were an Eye where were the Hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the Smelling? But now hath God set the Members, every one of them in the Body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one Member, where were the Body? But now are they many Members, yet but one Body. And the Eye cannot say unto the Hand, I have no need of thee: Nor again the Head to the Feet, I have no need of you. But God hath tempered the Body together, that there should be no Schism in the Body; but that the Members should have the same Care one for another. And whether one Member suffer, all the Members suffer with it; or one Member be honoured, all the Members rejoyce with it. Now ye are the Body of* Christ *and Members in particular.* That is all Christians, all that are baptized into his Church make one Body, and every single Christian is a Member of that Body, and helps to make up the whole whatever his Station be. And he that is in the lowest Station of the Church can no more say he is no Member of it, because he is not higher advanced, than the Foot, because it is the lowest Part of the Body, can say that it is not of the Body, because it is not the Hand. And as it would be unnatural and monstrous in the Natural Body for the Foot to be placed where the Hand should be, and to perform the Offices of the Hand, and to drive down the Hand into the Place of the Feet; so it would be as monstrous and unnatural in the Body of *Christ*, that is in the Church, for any Member of it to execute the Functions not belonging to his proper Station. For this would be to make all one Member, which must destroy the Body, which neither does nor can consist of one Member, but of many. Not of many huddled together in a Lump, but tempered and disposed in a due Order for the Use and Beauty of the whole.

He

He therefore that breaks this Order and puts any Member out of its proper Place makes a Schism in the Body, and destroys the Beauty of it, and hinders the Members from performing their proper Functions.

§ XXIX. S. *Paul* having, by this Comparison of the Church to the Natural Body of a Man, shewn how absurd and monstrous it is for all Men to suppose that they have every one the same Office in the Church, but that there must be different Stations and different Employments for the several Members, or else that it can be no Body, proceeds then to go on, and particularly names the several Functions at that time allotted by God to such as he had appointed to officiate in his Church, saying, (e) *God hath set some in his Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that Miracles, then Gifts of Healing, Helps, Governments, Diversities of Tongues. Are all Apostles? Are all Prophets? Are all Teachers? Are all Workers of Miracles? Have all the Gifts of Healing? Do all speak with Tongues? Do all interpret? But covet earnestly the best Gifts. And yet I shew unto you a more excellent Way.* As if he had said, It is indeed very commendable in every one to desire the best Gifts, and to strive to qualify himself for the highest Offices in the Church, yet the Way that I now shew you, which is to keep your proper Stations in which you are placed till you are regularly called to an higher Office, and not to make a Schism in the Body of *Christ*, which cannot be avoided if all will be Apostles, all Prophets, all Teachers, *&c.* is much more excellent than the bare obtaining such Gifts. For, as he goes on, (f) *Though I speak with the Tongues of*

(e) 1 *Cor.* xii. 28, 29, 30, 31.
(f) 1 *Cor.* xiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

*Men*

*Men and of Angels, and have not Charity,* (that is, as is evident from what goes before, do not preſerve the Unity of the Church or Body of *Chriſt*, by keeping to my proper Station in it, but uſurp another's Office, or ſupport and aſſiſt or joyn my ſelf to thoſe that do) *I am become as ſounding Braſs or a tinkling Cymbal. And though I have the Gift of Prophecy, and underſtand all Myſteries and all Knowledge, and though I have all Faith, ſo that I could remove Mountains, and have not Charity* (do not preſerve that due Subordination of one Member to another in the Chriſtian Church) *I am nothing. And though I beſtow all my Goods to feed the Poor, and though I give my Body to be burned,* and die a Martyr for the Chriſtian Faith, *and have not Charity,* but diſunite the Church by Schiſmatical Communion, *it profiteth me nothing. Charity ſuffereth Long and is kind, Charity envyeth not, Charity vaunteth not itſelf, is not puffed up,* (He that reſolves to preſerve the Unity of the Church will bear any wrong or Injury rather than make a Schiſm, and return Good for Evil, he will not be envious to ſee another advanced above him, he will not over-value himſelf, or be guilty of any Inſolence towards his Superiors or any elſe,) *doth not behave itſelf unſeemly, ſeeketh not her own, is not eaſily provoked, thinketh no Evil. Rejoyceth not in Iniquity, but rejoyceth in the Truth. Beareth all Things, believeth all things, hopeth all Things, endureth all Things.* He that makes the Unity of the Church his main Care and Concern will do nothing unbecoming a Member of *Chriſt*'s Body, nothing which may tend to injure that Body or any Member of it, but will ſtudy to do and bear every Thing for *Chriſt* and his Church's Sake. *Charity never faileth, but whether there be Prophecies, they ſhall fail, whether there be Tongues they ſhall ceaſe, whether there be Knowledge it ſhall vaniſh away.* This Unity of the Church, this Communion of Saints, or of all the true Members of *Chriſt*'s Body ſhall never

never have End: When all the Gifts and Graces before-mentioned ſhall ceaſe, this ſhall continue to everlaſting Ages.

§ XXX. Thus did S. *Paul* vindicate his own Power and Authority over the *Corinthians*, ſhewing them, that if they withdrew their Obedience from him to ſet up oppoſite Paſtors independent on him, they muſt and would entirely deprive themſelves of all the Benefits of Chriſtianity: For to ſet up other chief Spiritual Governors in Oppoſition to him who was their proper Spiritual Father in *Chriſt*, would be like putting the Feet of the Natural Body into the Place of the Hands, or the Ears into the Place of the Eyes, which muſt make a *Schiſm* in the Body; and that ſo doing they would break the Band of Charity, and ſo render all their Gifts and Graces, all their Spiritual Functions and Miniſtrations, nay even their Faith and Sufferings, even Martyrdom itſelf, of no Value. Which plainly ſhews, that he did not ſuppoſe the People could, at their Pleaſure, remove one Apoſtle, Biſhop or Paſtor, and put another in his Place; but on the contrary he lets them know, that if they did ſo they would become Schiſmaticks, and deſtitute of that Charity which was neceſſary to make them acceptable to God, and without which nothing could make them acceptable.

§ XXXI. And if the People could not depoſe one Biſhop or chief Spiritual Governor, and ſet up another in Oppoſition to him, or in his Stead, as S. *Paul* has ſo plainly taught us, it is certain the Civil Magiſtrate cannot do it; for as to Spiritual Power or Authority he is but one of the People and a Subject of the Church. His Civil Power indeed may be exerciſed over Spiritual Perſons alſo where the Church needs his Protection and Aſſiſtance againſt outward Force; but the Apoſtolical or Epiſcopal Authority

Authority is a Spiritual Power derived immediately from *Christ*, and consequently cannot be vacated by any Civil Power. And therefore though the Civil Magistrate should renounce his due Obedience to his Rightful, Spiritual Father, and set up another in his stead, and command the People to do so too, threatning them with Civil Penalties if they do not; yet this will not justify such a Revolt and make it no Sin: Such Deposition of the Rightful Pastor, and joyning in Communion with the Intruder, will be nevertheless a Schism and a Breach of the Band of Charity, and according to the Apostle's Doctrine, written by the infallible Direction of the Holy Ghost, will render all their Doings as nothing worth.

§ XXXII. Neither did S. *Paul*'s Absence or Non-Residence amongst them defeat his Title to their Obedience; for though he was so long absent that some supposed, (*g*) he would not visit them any more, yet he, even during that Absence, challeng'd their Obedience: (*h*) *He was indeed absent from them in Body, but he was present in Spirit*; that is, in his Spiritual Power and Authority deligated to the Resident Presbyters that acted under him, or to some Bishop, such as (*i*) *Timothy*, or (*k*) *Titus* whom he sent to visit them in his own stead. And it was during his Absence that this Faction in the Church of *Corinth* was set up against him, for which he so much blames them from one end of his Epistle to the other: Neither was he present with them when he challeng'd their Obedience to him. A clear Evidence that he was as much the Bishop or chief Pastor of the *Corinthians* when he was at *Philippi* in *Macedonia* (from whence the Postscript says his two Epistles to that

(g) 1 *Cor.* iv. 18. (h) 1 *Cor.* v. 3.
(i) 1 *Cor.* iv. 17. (k) 2 *Cor.* xii. 18.

Church

Church were written) as when he was in any Part of *Achaia*, or even at *Corinth* itself. His necessary Absence from that Part of his Charge did not take away the Relation he bore to that Flock. Whosoever acted there as a Spiritual Guide independent on him broke the Unity of that Church and the Band of Charity, and became a Schismatick, and so were also all those that communicated with such an Intruder.

§ XXXIII. Neither did the Interposition of the Civil Magistrate, who forbad him to execute his Office in that or any other Place, make any Alteration in this Matter, or authorize those that were S. *Paul*'s Spiritual Subjects to withdraw their Obedience from him and confer it on another. The Magistrates (*l*) frequently imprison'd him, and thereby rendred him uncapable of discharging his Function either at *Corinth* or elsewhere; yet this, by no means discharged the People committed to his Charge from their Duty to him: He was their Apostle, their Bishop, their Spiritual Father as well when he was in Prison, and not only forbidden, but actually restrained by the Civil Magistrate from the Execution of his Office, as when at Liberty. Thus was he deposed or barred the Exercise of his Function by an *Irresistible Party*, for they who could imprison, scourge and stone him, and in short handle him just as they pleased, were certainly *irresistible*. And by such a Party S. *Paul* was often deposed as far as it lay in their Power to depose him, whilst those that were puffed up against him had Liberty to preach and exercise their Functions in his District or Diocese. Yet this, as he has plainly taught us, did not deprive him of his Right over the *Corinthians*, or any other Part of his Charge, or justify those that joined with the In-

(l) 2 *Cor.* xi. 23.

truders

truders againſt him. The Intruders and all thoſe that adhered to them were nevertheleſs *Schiſmaticks*, although the Civil Magiſtrate, with an irreſiſtible Force, hindred S. *Paul* from officiating to his Flock, and permitted them to do it, S. *Paul* did not allow that they ſhould be rightful Paſtors of the Church of *Corinth*, becauſe they had got Poſſeſſion there, and he by Reaſon of his Abſence might ſeem to be out of Poſſeſſion; nay, ſeemed not likely to come amongſt them any more, being ſo often impriſoned for executing his Paſtoral Office, (*m*) and in perpetual Danger of being put to Death, as he more than once tells them. And yet theſe Men who had got Poſſeſſion of S. *Paul*'s Chair at *Corinth* were otherwiſe Orthodox; for he charges them with no falſe Doctrine otherwiſe than as they made a *Schiſm*, and intruded themſelves into his Diſtrict, in Oppoſition to him. However, he lets the *Corinthians* know, that by joining with ſuch Men, and yielding Obedience to them as their Spiritual Fathers, they brake the Band of Charity; and therefore though they ſpoke with the Tongues of Men and of Angels, it would not profit them.

§ XXXIV. Theſe Intruders had the Civil Power on their ſide, and though it does not appear that the Magiſtrates directly authorized them to exerciſe the Office of Spiritual Guides at *Corinth*; yet it is manifeſt that they connived at them, and tolerated them, which they would not do by S. *Paul* or any of the Apoſtles. So that the *Corinthians* could not adhere to S. *Paul*, but they muſt ſuffer Perſecution for it: But to thoſe Guides that were ſet up in Oppoſition to S. *Paul*, they might adhere without any ſuch Danger. This that Apoſtle obſerves, ſaying, (*n*) *Now ye are*

(*m*) 1 Cor. xv. 31. 2 Cor. xi. 23. (*n*) 1 Cor. iv. 8.

*full*

*full, now ye are rich, ye have reigned as Kings without us.* As if he had ſaid, *Now ye have caſt* me off and got new Guides to direct you, you live happily and at eaſe; you are not diſturbed either by the *Jews* or by the *Heathen*, but enjoy all the Liberty and Freedom you can deſire. *And I would to God ye did reign, that we alſo might reign with you.* I heartily wiſh that you had obtained or preſerved this Freedom by juſtifiable Means, and that it was not granted you on Account of your Oppoſition to me, and becauſe ye have rejected my Authority, that I might enjoy it with you. *For I think that God hath ſet forth us the Apoſtles laſt, as it were Men appointed unto Death: For we are made a Spectacle to the World, and to Angels, and to Men.* We Apoſtles ſeem to be the only Men now ſtruck at, others may preach with ſafety and without Danger. But we are expoſed to Dangers, Contempt and Scorn. *We are Fools for Chriſt's ſake, but ye are wiſe in Chriſt; we are Weak, but ye are Strong; ye are honourable, but we are deſpiſed.* We are vile and deſpiſed for doing our Duty, and continuing to exerciſe our Apoſtolical Office notwithſtanding all the Dangers and Hazards we incurr by ſo doing, but ye are wiſe Chriſtians that leaving our Communion and joining yourſelves to thoſe that know how to make an Intereſt with the Magiſtrates can ſecure yourſelves and avoid Perſecution. Hereby you live honourably and creditably in the World, whilſt we are contemptible. *Even unto this preſent Hour we both Hunger and Thirſt, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain Dwelling-Place. And labour, working with our own Hands; being reviled we bleſs; being perſecuted we ſuffer it; being defamed we intreat*, and pray to God for them that Calumniate or falſely accuſe us; *we are made as the Filth of the World, and the Offſcouring of all things unto this Day. I write not theſe Things to ſhame you, but as my beloved Sons I warn you.* Though I have been thus uſed ſince theſe *Schiſms* have

have come in amongſt you, yet I do not now mention it in order to reproach you for the ill Uſage I have received at your Hands, in that you have forſaken me, becauſe I have been perſecuted by the Civil Powers, and thereby hindred from coming to you, and have ſet up others to communicate with as Guides in Oppoſition to me. *For though you have ten thouſand Inſtructers in* Chriſt, *yet have ye not many Fathers; for in* Chriſt Jeſus *I have begotten you through the Goſpel. Wherefore, I beſeech you be ye Followers of me.* Though you have had never ſo many Preachers amongſt you, yet have you not many Spiritual Fathers, Apoſtles or Biſhops; for I am your proper Apoſtle or Biſhop, having a Right to your Spiritual Obedience, by planting the Goſpel among you, and therefore no other can challenge that Authority over it, 'till I deliver it to a Succeſſor, either by Death or Reſignation; or at leaſt by ſome juſt Forfeiture: And for this Reaſon I muſt ſtill intreat you to adhere to me as your proper Biſhop. *For this Cauſe have I ſent unto you* Timotheus, *who is my beloved Son and faithful in the Lord, who ſhall bring you into remembrance of my Ways, which be in* Chriſt, *as I teach every where in every Church. Now ſome are puffed up, as though I would not come to you.* I will ſend *Timothy* to ſupply my Place for the preſent, and foraſmuch as ſome by reaſon of my Abſence take occaſion to deſpiſe me, *I will come to you ſhortly, if the Lord will.*

§ XXXV. From hence we may juſtly conclude, that neither S. *Paul*'s Abſence, nor the Civil Magiſtrate's forbidding him to execute his Office whilſt he permitted others, Orthodox enough in all other reſpects, (for ought that appears to the contrary) to ſupply his Place, and take the Care of his Church in Oppoſition to him, could really take away his Right to the Spiritual Charge of that Diſtrict which was his peculiar Care, to Authorize the People to join with thoſe

thoſe Intruders, ſince it is the main End of his Epiſtles to the *Corinthians* to convince them that they were in the wrong in ſo doing. Not that he was for hindring any one from coming thither in his Abſence, or even when he was preſent, to teach and inſtruct the People in Conjunction with himſelf, nor was he offended that *Apollos* or *Cephas* or any other Miniſter of *Chriſt* ſhould water what he had planted, whilſt they acted only as Brothers, Companions or Fellow-Labourers; if they were Apoſtles of the ſame Order with himſelf; or as Miniſters under him, if they were of an Inferior Order. But he could not approve that they ſhould do thus within his Line, in Oppoſition to him, and without any Dependence upon him, without any regard to his Juriſdiction there, as the true Apoſtle or Biſhop of that Flock; nor could he like of the Peoples joining in Communion with ſuch Men as their Paſtors. Hence it is manifeſt, that the Civil Magiſtrates forbidding an Apoſtle or Biſhop to exerciſe his Function, and not only threatning, but actually executing the ſevereſt Temporal Puniſhments upon him, if he ſhall diſobey in this Caſe, does not really diveſt ſuch Apoſtle or Biſhop of his Spiritual Authority over his Flock, or Authorize an Intruder to take Poſſeſſion of his See; nor will it juſtify the People that ſhall join with ſuch an Intruder in this Caſe.

§ XXXVI. Thoſe who firſt engaged in this Argument of late Years, did not undertake to juſtify *Lay-Deprivations*, but only pretended we may *comply* with them, though ſuppoſing them to be not only *Unjuſt*, but *Invalid*, if impoſed by an *irreſiſtible Power*, provided thoſe be otherwiſe Orthodox, who take Poſſeſſion of their Places. Dr. *Hody* indeed has told us, that he reſerved (o) *the Vindication of the Authority of*

(o) *Preface to the Caſe of* Sees Vacant, *&c.*

*the Civil Power, in depriving a Biſhop for Political Crimes*, for a particular Treatiſe. But upon farther Conſideration, he thought it better not to make any ſuch Attempt. But that which he did think proper to maintain, was, that *granting all Lay-deprivations were invalid; nay, ſuppoſing them not only uncanonical but unjuſt; nay, ſuppoſe the Depriver not only a Lay-man but doubly unqualified by being likewiſe an Heretick: Suppoſe beſides that the ejected Biſhop was deprived for adhering to the Truth, and for oppoſing Vice or Hereſy: Notwithſtanding all this, he aſſerts, That if he was deprived by a Power* irreſiſtible, *a Submiſſion to the preſent Poſſeſſor, (if otherwiſe unexceptionable) is lawful and warranted by the general Practice of the Ancients.* And in order to prove this, he gives us a long Catalogue of Examples from the Practice of the Ancient Church, as he calls it. But his eldeſt Inſtances come not up to the fourth Century, and all before are directly againſt him as has been ſhewed by the Learned Author of the *Hiſtorical Collections.* They are all Inſtances taken from the Corrupt Ages of the Church, and were they all fairly repreſented (and they are many of them far from being ſo) would not be proper Precedents for us to follow. Indeed the Caſe of *Euſtathius* of *Antioch*, and of S. *John Chryſoſtom* come within the fourth Century; and might be allowed as good Precedents, but he has ſhamefully miſrepreſented them, for being rightly ſtated and conſidered, they are directly againſt him. But if they were not, this Inſtance of S. *Paul* the Apoſtle and Biſhop of the *Corinthians*, is a Precedent beyond all others; and if he did not think the *ſecular Power*, which is what Dr. *Hody* means by his *Irreſiſtible Force*, could depoſe him from his *Spiritual Authority* over the *Corinthians*, then can they not depoſe any of his Succeſſors, that is any Biſhop of *his* Authority over his Dioceſe. Now that the ſecular Governors depoſed S. *Paul*, as far as it was in their Power to do, is moſt certain from what

I have

I have already produced. For they forbad him to exerciſe his Function of an Apoſtle or Biſhop; and when he did not think fit to obey them, being of the ſame Opinion with the other Apoſtles, that he ought to obey God rather than Man, they impriſon'd him, they ſcourged him, they threatned him with Death, and had actually put him to Death if he had not made Eſcapes from them by getting out of a Window in a Basket or ſuch like way. Whilſt S. *Paul* lay under this State Depoſition, under this *irreſiſtible Force*, ſome Perſons came to *Corinth*, which was S. *Paul*'s Diſtrict or Dioceſe, and took upon them to govern that Church Independent on him, the Magiſtrates gave theſe Men no Diſturbance, but permitted them to perform the Offices of Chriſtian Prieſts in that Place, and that Church was free from Perſecution, whilſt they withdrew from S. *Paul*'s Communion. Yet this Submiſſion of theirs to the preſent Poſſeſſors whilſt S. *Paul* was kept from them by an *irreſiſtible Power*, was the very thing he condemned them for; the thing for which he blamed them in both his Epiſtles, and told them that whilſt they continued in this Schiſm, all their Gifts and Graces; nay, all the good Deeds they could perform under ſuch a Breach of Charity or Unity of the Church, would profit them Nothing. And theſe Epiſtles of S. *Paul*, contain not his bare Opinion, but were written by Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt. They are the Word of God, and therefore the Doctrines contained in them are of Divine Authority, and are not to be cancelled by any humane Reaſons or Precedents. And the Practice of the truly Primitive Church, was agreeable to this very Doctrine, as is evident from their acting, with regard to the *Novatians*, the *Donatiſts* and the *Meletians*.

§ XXXVII. *It's alledged,* (p) (ſays Dr. *Hody*) *by one of our Adverſaries that the* Novatians, *the* Donatiſts, *and the* Meletians *of* Egypt *were* Schiſmaticks *in the Opinion of the Church, becauſe the* Biſhops *who firſt headed them, were* ſecond Biſhops; *but this is eaſily anſwer'd: For the* Biſhops *whom they followed, were not ſet up by any* Sovereign coercive Power, *in the room of others depoſed, but were ſet up by Inferiour Perſons, againſt others poſſeſſed of the Sees. I have already ſaid, that it is not every one whom a* ſmall tumultuous *Party ſhall get to be ordained, that ought to be received as a Biſhop; but that which we maintain is this, That where the lawful Biſhop is depoſed by an* irreſiſtible Party, *there the Succeſſor may be acknowledged.*

§ XXXVIII. But it is evident from S. *Cyprian* (an Author who lived in the time of *Novatian*, and has given a fuller Account of the Riſe of that *Schiſm* than any other) that the *Novatians* were not a *ſmall tumultuous Party*, but a *very numerous Body*, and alſo had the Protection of the State when the Orthodox had it not. And if they were not at firſt ſet up by the *Sovereign Power*, they were ſoon received and protected by it; they were allowed to purchaſe Lands and Houſes, to build Churches and enjoy them, and were protected in the Execution of their Spiritual Functions, whilſt the Catholicks were perſecuted by the Emperors *Gallus* and *Voluſianus*. That they were a numerous Body, diffuſed in all Parts of the Empire, S. *Cyprian* ſhews when he tells us, (q) *That whereas*

(p) *Caſe of* Sees Vacant, *pag.* 195.

(q) Cumq; jampridem per omnes Provincias & per Urbes ſingulas Ordinati ſint Epiſcopi, in ætate antiqui, in fide integri, in Preſſura Probati, in Perſecutione proſcripti; Ille ſuper eos creare alios Pſeudoepiſcopos audeat. Quaſi poſſit aut totum Orbem novi conatus obſtinatione peragrare, *Cypr. Epiſt.* 55. *p.* 112.

*long*

*long ſince Biſhops venerable for Age, ſound in Faith, approved by Oppreſſion, proſcribed in Perſecutions, have been ordained in all Provinces, and in every City, he* [Novatian] *dares to put over their Heads other Pſeudo-Biſhops, as if he was able to over-run the World by perſiſting in his new Attempt.* For a ſmall tumultuous Party could not immediately ſet up Biſhops in all the Provinces and Cities of that large Empire, which contained the greateſt part of the then known World. That they were allowed to purchaſe Lands and Houſes, to build Churches and enjoy them; nay, and to take Poſſeſſion at leaſt of ſome Churches, and Church-Lands or Houſes belonging to the Catholicks, which it is certain they could not have done, had they not been protected and encouraged by the Secular Power, appears from a Law of *Conſtantine* the Great, made about 80 Years after the *Schiſm* began,(r) wherein he confirms to the *Novatians*, all their Poſſeſſions which they had a long time enjoy'd, excepting only thoſe which belonged to the Catholicks before the *Schiſm.* That they were alſo protected in the Exerciſe of their Functions whilſt the Catholicks were perſecuted by the Emperors *Gallus* and *Voluſianus*, is evident from S. *Cyprian*, who in an Epiſtle to *Cornelius* the true Biſhop of *Rome*, againſt whom *Novatianus* was ſet up, having congratulated *Cornelius* for his bold Confeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, and for his ſuffering Baniſhment in ſo good a Cauſe, ſays,

(r) Itaq; Eccleſiæ ſuæ Domos, & loca ſepulchris apta, ſine inquietudine eos firmiter præcipimus: ea ſcilicet quæ ex diuturno tempore vel exemplo habuerunt vel qualibet quæſierunt ſatione. Providendum erit ne quid uſurpare conentur ex his quæ ante diſcidium, ad Eccleſias perpetuæ ſanctitatis pertinuiſſe manifeſtum eſt. *Cod. Theodoſ. l.* 2. *lit.* 5.

(s) *But what says* Novatian *to this? —— Does he yet acknowledge who is God's Priests? Which is the Church and House of Christ? Who are the Servants of Christ, whom the Devil Persecutes? Who are the Christians whom Antichrist fights against? For he does not seek after those whom he has already subdued; or endeavour to overturn those whom he has already made his own. The Foe and Enemy of the Church contemns and passes by those whom he has alienated from the Church, and lead out of it as already his Bondsmen and Captives: He goes on to provoke those in whom he sees Christ to dwell.* Now, if *Novatian*, or any of his Party had suffer'd in this Persecution under *Gallus* and *Volusian*, or had not been permitted to exercise their Functions and Ministrations, S. *Cyprian* could not have made the Sufferings of *Cornelius* and his Adherents a Testimony of the Righteousness of their Cause above that of the *Novatians*. Would *Novatian* have had any Reason to think *Cornelius* to have been God's Priest, upon the account of his Sufferings, rather than himself, if he had also suffered as the other did? It is plain then, that the Emperors *Gallus* and *Volusianus*, persecuted the Catholicks and let the *Novatians* alone. Yet although *Cornelius* was banished, and so deposed or turned out of his Bishoprick by a *Soveraign*, *Coercive*, *Irresistible Power*, the Catholick Christians did not for that Reason think they might accept *Novatian* for their Bishop: But immediately after the Martyrdom

(s) Quid adhæc Novatianus, frater Chariſſime? — Agnoſcitne jam qui ſit ſacerdos Dei? Quæ ſit Eccleſia & Domus Chriſti? Qui ſint Dei ſervi quos diabolus infeſtet? Qui ſint Chriſtiani quos Antichriſtus impugnet? Neq; enim quærit illos, quos jam ſubegit, aut geſtit evertere, quos jam ſuos fecit. Inimicus & hoſtis Eccleſiæ quos alienavit ab Eccleſia & foras duxit, ut captivos & vinctos contemnit & præterit; eos pergit laceſſere in quibus Chriſtum cernit habitare. *Cypr. Epiſt.* 60.

of

of *Cornelius*, which happened in a ſhort time after his Baniſhment; *Lucius* was conſecrated in his ſtead, who was alſo baniſhed, but lived to return from his Baniſhment, upon the Death of *Gallus* and *Voluſian*, which happened not long after, for they did not Reign a whole Year; and then the Perſecution ceaſed for a time. To this *Lucius*, S. *Cyprian* alſo writes and Congratulates him upon his Return from his Baniſhment; and amongſt other things ſays thus, (t) *We underſtand, our deareſt Brother, and ſee with the whole Eye of our Heart, the ſalutary and holy Counſels of the Divine Majeſty; whence that ſudden Perſecution ſo lately aroſe; whence the ſecular Power ſo ſuddenly fell upon* Cornelius *the Biſhop and bleſſed Martyr, and upon all of you: That to confound and repel the Hereticks God ſhewed, which was his Church, who his own Biſhop, choſen by divine Appointment; who the Presbyters joined in the Honour of the Prieſthood with the Biſhop; which the united and true People of* Chriſt, *joined together in Charity as the Lord's Flock; who they were whom the Enemy contended with, who on the contrary, whom the Devil ſpared as his own.* Thus we ſee that from the Beginning of this Perſecution to the End of it, the *Novatians* bore no ſhare of it. For it is plain by thoſe he calls *Hereticks* in this Paſſage, he means them; for his Words here are much the ſame in Senſe, with thoſe

(t) Intelligimus, frater Chariſſime, & tota cordis noſtri luce perſpicimus divinæ Majeſtatis ſalutaria & ſancta conſilia; unde illic repentina perſecutio nuper exorta ſit, unde contra Eccleſiam Chriſti & Epiſcopum Cornelium beatum Martyrem, voſq; omnes ſæcularis poteſtas ſubito proruperit: ut ad confundendos Hæreticos & retundendos oſtenderit Dominus, quæ eſſet Eccleſia, quis Epiſcopus ejus unus, divina Ordinatione delectus; qui cum Epiſcopo Presbyteri Sacerdotali honore conjuncti; quis adunatus & verus Chriſti populus Dominici Gregis Charitate connexus: Qui eſſent quos inimicus laceſſeret, qui contra, quibus diabolus ut ſuis parceret. *Cypr. Ep.* 60.

before quoted from the former Epiſtle, which are expreſly applied to *Novatian* and his Followers by Name: Then thoſe Words, *who is one Biſhop*, muſt refer to *Novatian*, who ſet up for the *other Biſhop*. We cannot therefore ſay, that the *Novatians* were a ſmall tumultuous Party who had no Sovereign coercive Power to ſupport them: For it is plain, the Emperor was of *Novatian*'s Side: For he baniſh'd *Cornelius*, his Competitor, and put him to Death; and when *Lucius* was ordained his Succeſſor, he baniſh'd him alſo, leaving the ſole Poſſeſſion to *Novatian*; and yet the Church looked upon *Novatian* and his Followers to be as much Schiſmaticks whilſt they had the ſole Poſſeſſion of the Chriſtian Churches as they were before or after.

§ XXXIX. Then as to the *Donatiſts*, though they were indeed a *tumultuous Party*, they were far from being a *ſmall Party*, for they had as many Biſhops in *Africa* as the Catholicks themſelves: And by Means of their *Circumcellions* or *Banditti* were very often an *Irreſiſtible Party*: And in the Reign of *Julian* had the *Sovereign Coercive* Power on their Side, as we may learn from *Optatus* and S. *Auſtin*, and all that have given us any Account of that *Schiſm*. Neither were the *Meletians* of *Egypt* a *ſmall Party*, for they were too many for the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, the Primate of that Country, to deal with; nor could the Council of *Nice* itſelf effectually quell them. (*u*) Dr. *Hody* ſays, *The only Queſtion is, whether* Paul *or* Apollos *may be follow'd when* Cephas *is in Priſon, and is render'd uncapable of acting as an Apoſtle*? And I ſuppoſe it is the ſame thing if we ask, *Whether it be lawful to follow* Cephas *or* Apollos *when* Paul *is in Priſon*. For the Caſe is juſt the ſame, and the Anſwer is very eaſy, and

(u) *Caſe of Sees vacant. Pag.* 12.

made

made by S. *Paul* himſelf. (*w*) If *Apollos* or *Cephas* come in to water what S. *Paul* has planted, they do well. If they come in as Friends or Aſſiſtants to S. *Paul* to feed his Flock whilſt he is diſabled from doing it himſelf, and act therein only as his Companions and Fellow-Labourers, they may and ought to be followed, for ſo to follow them is to follow *Paul* alſo, whether he be in Priſon or not, whether he be preſent or abſent. But if *Cephas* or *Apollos* come into S. *Paul*'s Diſtrict, and one of them tells the People he is now their Spiritual Father in *Paul*'s ſtead, and they are no more to look upon *Paul* as their Apoſtle or Biſhop, becauſe he is impriſoned and rendred uncapable of acting as an Apoſtle among them, this S. *Paul* would ſay is (*x*) *ſtretching themſelves beyond their Meaſure, and boaſting in another Man's Line.* And whether it was *Apollos* or *Cephas* that did this, he would be a Schiſmatick, and break the Band of Charity, and therefore though he ſpake with the Tongues of Men and of Angels, he ought not to be followed, for he could profit them nothing. S. *Paul* was frequently impriſoned, and yet, as I have ſhewed, he did not think that he thereby loſt his Right of Spiritual Obedience from the *Corinthians*, and (*y*) *therefore beſeeches them to be Followers of him.* And indeed it would be a very hard Caſe if a Paſtor was to loſe his Right over his Flock, becauſe he is impriſon'd, as S. *Paul* was, for doing his Duty: Yet this is what the Doctor has pleaded for. *Suppoſe*, ſays he, *that the ejected Biſhop was deprived for adhering to the* Truth, *and for oppoſing* Vice *or* Hereſy: *Notwithſtanding all this, I aſſert, That if he was deprived by a Power* Irreſtible, *a Submiſſion to the preſent Poſſeſſor* (*if otherwiſe unexceptionable*) *is lawful and warranted by the general Practice of the Ancients.* But we have ſeen

(*w*) 1 *Cor.* iii. 6. (*x*) 2 *Cor.* x. 14. 16. (*y*) 1 *Cor.* xiv. 16.

that

that it is not warranted by the Scripture, nor by the moſt ancient Church in the Caſe of the *Novatians*, *Donatiſts*, and *Meletians*, who were the firſt that formed a *Schiſm* by bringing in a ſecond Biſhop into a full See. And we have ſeen that S. *Cyprian* was ſo far from thinking that the Impriſonment of *Cornelius* or *Lucius* could give *Novatian* a Right to the Biſhoprick of *Rome*, becauſe they were thereby incapacitated to act as Biſhops, and *Novatian* was left as the ſole Biſhop in full Poſſeſſion of that Church, as far as a Sovereign coercive Power could give him Poſſeſſion, by permitting him at leaſt, if not authorizing him, to poſſeſs the Houſes and Churches belonging to the Catholicks before the Breach (as I have proved from the Law of *Conſtantine*, which commanded them to be reſtored) and by leaving no other Biſhop to act in *Rome* but himſelf, that he makes this very Thing an Argument that *Cornelius* and *Lucius* were the true and rightful Biſhops, and that *Novatian* was not ſo; that God approved of thoſe two as his Biſhops, becauſe he permitted them to be impriſoned, and did not approve of *Novatian*, becauſe he let him and his Party eſcape the Perſecution. So far is the Doctor's Aſſertion, that *though a Biſhop be deprived by a* Sovereign coercive Power *for adhering to the Truth, yet it may be lawful to comply with the Succeſſor*, who is permitted or authorized by *that Sovereign Power* to ſupply his Place, from being agreable to the Senſe of the Ancients, that nothing is more contrary to the Senſe of truly Primitive Antiquity, as well as to the Scriptures themſelves.

§ XL. But after all there is no ſuch Thing in this Caſe as *Irreſiſtible Force*. Lawful Sovereign Powers are indeed always *Irreſiſtible*, ſo as they may not be oppoſed by Arms though we had ſufficient Strength

to

to reſiſt them; (z) for all ſuch Reſiſtance is forbidden under the Penalty of Damnation: But if by *Reſiſtance* we underſtand not complying with or yielding Obedience to their juſt Commands, then no humane Power can be *Irreſiſtible*; for we may chooſe to obey God rather than Man, and ſuffer Perſecution and all Temporal Penalties they will inflict with Patience and Reſignation to the Will of God, and by Prayers and Tears commit our Cauſe to him, as the Primitive Chriſtians did. And by this Means they at laſt, in God's good Time, which is always the beſt and moſt proper Time, overcame their Perſecutors, and brought the Powers of the World into the Church. But ſhameful Compliances againſt the Truth, which is what the Doctor pleads for, never proved to the Advantage of the Church, how likely ſoever in humane Reaſon it might appear proper to produce ſuch an Effect.

§ XLI. It is further objected by ſome, that the *Jewiſh* Prieſts were of Divine Inſtitution as well as the *Chriſtian*, and therefore as to their Prieſthood as much independent on the Civil Power, yet King *Solomon* depoſed the High-Prieſt *Abiathar* and put *Zadok* in his Room. But if we look into the Story as related in the Scripture, we ſhall find that *Solomon* did not depoſe *Abiathar*, as that ſignifies, depriving him of his *Prieſthood*, or even of the Station he held in the *Jewiſh* Church. For in the firſt place, it is certain *Abiathar* was not the *High-Prieſt*, but *Zadok*. For in the Time of *David*, (a) *Zadok* was over the *Aaronites*, or whole Family of the Prieſts. And when *David* fled from *Abſalom*, and the Prieſts followed him with the Ark, though *Abiathar* was there, yet the Charge of the Ark plainly belonged to *Zadok*,

(z) *Rom.* xiii. 2. (a) 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 17.

(*b*) for

(*b*) for it was he, and not *Abiathar*, conducted those that bore it; and he, and not *Abiathar*, was required by the King to carry it back to *Jerusalem*. And when these two are named together, (*c*) as they are in several Places, *Zadok* is always named first; and it cannot be thought it should always have been so if *Abiathar* had been the Superior: Yet we never read that *Abiathar* and *Zadok* were the Priests, but always *Zadok* and *Abiathar*. A sure Argument that *Zadok* was the *High-Priest*, and *Abiathar* but the Second Priest. It is also evident that the Hereditary Right to the High-Priesthood was in *Zadok*, (*d*) who was descended from *Eleazar* the eldest Son of *Aaron*, and not in *Abiathar*, (*e*) who was descended from *Ithamar* the youngest Son of *Aaron*. It is therefore a great Mistake to say, that *Abiathar* was the *High-Priest*, when it is so evident that not he, but *Zadok*, was so all along in the Days of *David*, and before this pretended Deposition by *Solomon*. However, was he the first or the second Priest, they say it is plain that *Solomon* deposed him. Let us then examine that Matter, and see whether he was properly deposed or not, that is, either deprived of his Priesthood or of his Station in the *Jewish* Church.

§ XLII. *Adonijah*, *Joab* and *Abiathar*, had entred into an open Rebellion against *David* and *Solomon*, for which *Solomon* thought fit to put the two former to Death; and if he had done the same by *Abiathar* he had done no more than he had Right to do. For an Ecclesiastical Function gives no one an Exemption from a due Obedience to the Civil Magistrate, or puts him out of the Power of the Temporal Laws. And

(*b*) 2 *Sam.* xv. 24, 25.

(*c*) 2 *Sam.* xv. 29, 35, 36. xvii. 15. xix. 11. xx. 25. 1 *Chr.* xv. 11.

(*d*) 1 *Chron.* vi. 53. (*e*) 1 *Chron.* xxiv. 3, 6.

there-

therefore *Solomon* had an undoubted Right to inflict what Temporal Punishment on *Abiathar* for his Treason that he pleased. But he thought fit to spare his Life, and only confine him to a gentle Imprisonment within his own Lands. (*f*) *And unto* Abiathar *the Priest said the King, Get thee unto* Anathoth *thine own Fields; for thou art worthy of Death: But I will not at this time put thee to Death.* This was *Solomon*'s Sentence which he passed upon this Priest; and was plainly no other than a Civil Sentence: For Confinement or Imprisonment, whether close or large, is undoubtedly the Right of the Civil Magistrate to inflict, and of no other; and this was all that *Solomon* did: He did not so much as take away his Lands from him which belonged to him as a Priest, but commanded him to go and live upon them. But if he had deprived him of his Priesthood, he must have deprived him of those Lands which were given by God to the Priests, and which therefore none but a Priest could enjoy. But then say the Adversaries, it follows in the next Place; *So* Solomon *thrust out* Abiathar *from being Priest unto the Lord.* Very right, by confining him to *Anathoth* he disabled him from executing his Office of a Priest in the Temple at *Jerusalem*: But *Solomon* passed no Sentence of Deposition or Deprivation upon him, which is the Ecclesiastical Sentence; he only passed the Sentence of Confinement. It is true, that Sentence of Confinement, whilst he lay under it, hindred him from officiating in the Temple, but so would a fit of Sickness or a broken Leg have done, yet surely no one will say that a broken Leg or a fit of Sickness deposes or deprives a Priest or Bishop, that it puts him out of the Station he held in the Church, and yet it will disable him from officiating for the Time, and effectually

(*f*) 1 *King.* ii. 26.

keep

keep him from executing his Office ſo long as it laſts. And therefore, notwithſtanding this pretended Depoſition, *Abiathar* was ſtill reputed to be the ſecond Prieſt in the Days of *Solomon*, even as he was in the Reign of *David*, for after this Confinement to *Anathoth*, we read (*g*) that *Zadok* and *Abiathar* were the Prieſts; which would not have been if he had been deprived of his Prieſthood, or of his Station in the Church, as well as hindred from executing his Office by Confinement. But they tell us, that he muſt have been deprived, becauſe another was put into his Room: For ſo ſays the Text, (*h*) *And* Zadok *the Prieſt did the King put in the Room of* Abiathar. But the Original is, *And* Zadok *the Prieſt did the King give for* Abiathar. Which cannot here mean, that he put *Zadok* into *Abiathar*'s Place, for that would have been to have degraded him from the Office of High-Prieſt to that of Second Prieſt. But as *Zadok* was High-Prieſt, it belonged to him to ſee that all Offices in the Temple were duly performed; conſequently if any Prieſt was, upon any Account, diſabled from officiating, he was obliged to ſee that Charge performed by himſelf, or ſome other Prieſt whom he ſhould appoint. Therefore the King having, by confining *Abiathar* to *Anathoth*, diſabled him from performing the Office of Second Prieſt in the Temple, directed *Zadok*, the High-Prieſt, to take care that the Office of the Second Prieſt might not be omitted by Reaſon of the Diſability of *Abiathar*. Thus he gave *Zadok* for *Abiathar*, by requiring him to ſee *Abiathar*'s Duty performed. As if our King ſhould, for ſome Temporal Crime, impriſon the Biſhop of *London*, and then bid the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* (to whom it belongs of Courſe during the Diſability of the proper Biſhop) to take care of that Dioceſe. This would be giving the Peo-

(*g*) 1 *King.* iv. 4. (*h*) 1 *King.* ii. 35.

ple

ple of *London* the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* for their own Biſhop, but would neither be depoſing the Biſhop of *London*, nor putting another in his Room. And yet this is plainly all that *Solomon* did with Relation to *Abiathar*.

§ XLIII. The Adverſaries to the Independency of the Church finding their Aſſertions to fail, and not to be maintainable, have ſince come to putting of Queries. And we are asked, *If Chriſt appointed, or his Apoſtles left, any Rule in the ſacred Writings for depoſing of Biſhops*? To which it may be anſwer'd, That it having been proved, that *Chriſt* himſelf ordain'd his Apoſtles, and *ſent them as he was ſent by the Father*, he thereby gave them Authority to ordain others to that Office as he had ordain'd them: And that it appears from the Sacred Writings, that they actually did inveſt others with the ſame Office whom we now call Biſhops: Therefore if neither he nor his Apoſtles have left any Rule for depoſing Biſhops, or given Authority to any to depoſe them, there cannot a Biſhop be depoſed; for being made by an Authority derived from *Chriſt*, they muſt be depoſed by an Authority derived from him, or not at all, otherwiſe we muſt ſet up an Authority in the Church above *Chriſt*: For if any Power on Earth can deprive a Man of a Power derived from *Chriſt*, without deriving that Power of Deprivation from him alſo, then has not *Chriſt* a Supreme Power over his Church, for there is another above him that can undo what he has done; which it would be both abſurd and blaſphemous for any Man to ſay. But the Sacred Writings have taught us, that a Biſhop may fall from his Biſhoprick by Tranſgreſſion, (*i*) for ſo they declare that *Judas* fell from his Apoſtleſhip; and that when a Biſhop ſo falls by Tranſgreſſion, then an-

(*i*) *Act.* i. 25. 20.

other

other ſhall take his Biſhoprick. And as *Chriſt*, by ſending his Apoſtles and their Succeſſors as he was ſent by the Father, plainly gave them Authority to make and ordain Biſhops; ſo he alſo as plainly gave them the Power to judge and declare when a Biſhop was fallen from his Biſhoprick by Tranſgreſſion. Thus (*k*) *Peter* and the other *Apoſtles* judged and declared in the Caſe of *Judas*. It is true, *Judas* was then dead, and ſo his Biſhoprick vacant another Way; but they did not declare the Vacancy to have accrued from his *Death*, but from his *Tranſgreſſion*: That was ſufficient to have made his Place vacant, though he had been ſtill alive. Here then is a Rule in the Sacred Writings for depoſing of Biſhops; no one has Authority to depoſe a Biſhop arbitrarily or without juſt Cauſe, but when he is guilty of ſuch Tranſgreſſion as juſtly makes a Vacancy of his Biſhoprick; then the College of Biſhops are to declare and judge concerning the Matter, and put another into his Place.

§ XLIV. Another Query is, *Was not the judging and depoſing of Biſhops by Provincial Synods in the Beginning, a Prudential, no Divine Inſtitution, ſuch a one as the Church thought to be beſt in their Circumſtances; as was the Diviſion of the whole Church into Diſtricts, called in our Modern Terms, Dioceſes and Provinces, after the Plan of the Civil Empire?* It may be anſwered, That I have already ſhewed, that the Diviſion of the Church into Diſtricts, which we now call *Dioceſes* or *Provinces*, was made by the Apoſtles themſelves, and that not meerly upon Prudential Reaſons, as is here ſuggeſted, but by the Directions of the Holy Ghoſt; and therefore St. *Paul* (*l*) calls his Diſtrict, *the Meaſure of the Rule or Line which God had diſtributed to him.* And if herein they followed the Plan of the Civil

(k) *Act.* i. 13, 15. (l) 2 *Cor.* x. 13.

Empire,

Empire, what follows from thence? Only that they ſaw no Occaſion to make new Meaſures and Boundaries for the World when they ſaw it already well bounded to their Hand. But ſtill they did not go to the Civil Magiſtrate to know which Province he would be pleaſed to allot to each Apoſtle. They firſt made S. *James* the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, allotting to him that City and its Territory; and the other Apoſtles diſperſed themſelves into the other Parts of the World, each taking ſuch a Province or Number of Provinces as was thought proper among themſelves. And when any of them had made ſuch a Multitude of Converts as were too many for his own ſingle Inſpection and Government, then he ordain'd ſome other Perſon to be Biſhop or chief Spiritual Ruler of ſuch a Diſtrict or Dioceſe within his Province as he thought fit to commit to his Charge; and they took care that no one ſhould meddle in another's Diſtrict, or (*m*) *ſtretch himſelf beyond his Meaſure*. Thus the whole Church was divided into Diſtricts or Dioceſes by the Apoſtles, as appears from the Sacred Writings; and therefore this was a Divine, not an Humane Inſtitution, as the Queriſt pretends, made upon Prudential Reaſons or by an Humane Authority, the Apoſtles in this, as in the other Settlements of the Church, following the Directions of the Holy Ghoſt. So alſo the Meeting of Provincial Synods, that is, Synods of Neighbouring Biſhops, to judge and determine concerning the Affairs of the Church, was not a meer Prudential Inſtitution, but derived from the Practice of the Apoſtles; who, by the Directions of the Holy Ghoſt, ſettled that Method for determining ſuch Controverſies as might ariſe. Thus, when a Controverſy aroſe concerning Circumciſion, (*n*) the Apoſtles met in Council at *Jeruſalem* to determine the

(m) 2 *Cor.* x. 14. (n) *Act.* xv.

Queſtion. And that they acted herein not upon Prudential Reaſons only, but by Divine Appointment, is evident from the Decree then made; wherein they ſay, (o) *It ſeemed good to the Holy-Ghoſt and to us.* And if the Holy-Ghoſt had not directed them to that Method of ending this Matter, they would not have enforced their Decree with his Authority. Is the Holy-Ghoſt to be made the Author of a meer Prudential Conſtitution? They had alſo an expreſs Warrant from *Chriſt* thus to determine Controverſies of the Church by meeting together in Synodical Aſſemblies; and he had promiſed, (p) *That where two or three ſhould ſo meet together in his Name, he would be in the midſt of them.* Not only to determine Matters of Faith, Doctrine or Practice, ſuch as are mention'd to have been determin'd in the Apoſtolical Synod, but to hear and determine Differences between Man and Man, (q) and to examine Witneſſes, conſequently to judge of all Matters wherein the Church may be concerned. And therefore as the Church is concerned to know whether a Biſhop is fallen from his Biſhoprick by Tranſgreſſion or not, they muſt thereby receive a Power to determine that alſo. For ſince the Scriptures teach us, that the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors the Biſhops, were ſent by *Chriſt* even as he was ſent by the Father, that is, were appointed to govern the Church under him as the *ſupreme Head*, for ſo the Words muſt mean, or they mean nothing; and he had before directed, that in Matters of Spiritual Judicature, they ſhould meet two or three, or more, to hear and determine ſuch Cauſes, and promiſed to be in the midſt of them to ratify and confirm their Judgment when ſo met in his Name, (r) and *to bind or looſe in Heaven what they ſhould at ſuch*

(o) *Act.* xv. 28. (p) *Matt.* xviii. 20.
(q) *Matt.* xviii. 16. (r) *Matt.* xviii. 18.

*Meetings*

*Meetings bind or loose on Earth*, it is plain that he authorized them to meet in Synods Provincial, National or Oecumenical, according as they conveniently might do, to judge all Spiritual Causes. And whether a Bishop has been guilty of such a Transgression as may forfeit his Bishoprick, is certainly a Spiritual Cause, and which the Apostles did judge in the case of *Judas*; it is evident then that *the Judging and Deposing of Bishops by Provincial Synods in the Beginning, was not a meer Prudential, but a Divine Institution, as was also the Division of the whole Church into certain Districts called in our Modern Terms Dioceses and Provinces, after the Plan of the Civil Empire.* As I have already proved.

§ XLV. It is also asked, *Did not the Emperors when they became Christian, yield the Causes of Bishops, as formerly to Synods, out of meer Favour, and as looking upon them to be abler Judges of Matters that concerned the Faith and Discipline of the Church than the Heathen Magistrates, who were then mostly possessed of those Offices under the Christian Emperors?* I have already proved in the Answer to the former Question, that Bishops had a Divine Right, or a Right by Divine Institution, given by Christ himself, to meet in Synods, to hear and determine Spiritual Causes. And therefore when Christian Emperors confirmed that Right by their Civil Laws, it was not a Matter of meer Favour, but what they were obliged to as Christians; if they had not done it, but had gone about to have taken that Right from them, they would in that particular have rejected the Authority of *Christ*, who gave them that Right some hundreds of Years before there was a Christian Emperor. For he made them, and not the Emperor and his Officers, whether Heathen or

(r) Mat. xviii. 18.

Christian, the only Judges of what concerned the Faith and Discipline of the Church. *Christ* and his Apostles settled the Faith and Discipline of the Church without the Emperor or any other Civil Magistrate whatsoever: And (s) *committed the same to faithful Men*; the Bishops and Pastors whom they appointed to succeed them, *who should be able to teach others also.* And when the Emperors became Christian they received and embraced the Faith and Discipline thus settled by *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and conveyed down to them by the Bishops who succeeded them. Therefore the Christian Emperors *yielding the Causes of Bishops to Synods, as to what concerned the Faith and Discipline of the Church*, was no matter of meer Favour, but a Right which they received from *Christ*. But their yielding the Causes of Bishops concerning Civil Matters to Synods, was, I confess a Matter of meer Favour, and that the first Christian Emperors did, as judging it not so proper to permit the Heathen Officers to be Judges of Bishops in any Matters. And many Governors of the Provinces were *Heathen* long after there were *Christian* Emperors. And this Distinction will help to solve the next Question. Which is,

§ XLVI. *Did not the Christian Emperors however, when they saw Reason, interpose in the Causes of Bishops, and determine them in another Way from the first Provincial Plan? Did not* Constantine *for Instance, the first Christian Emperor, order the Cause of* S. Athanasius, *Metropolitan of* Egypt, *to be heard by certain Eastern Bishops, whom he appointed, and at a Place remote from the Province of* Athanasius? To this it may be answer'd, That a Civil Cognisance of all Causes, even the most Spiritual that can be imagined belongs to

(s) 2 Tim. ii. 2.

every

every *Sovereign Prince*, as I have ſhewed in the Beginning of this Diſcourſe, whether he be *Heathen* or *Chriſtian*, and he may take Cognizance of it in ſuch Manner as to him ſeems moſt Expedient. And therefore if an Emperor was diſpoſed to take Cognizance of the Faith of any Biſhop, he was not bound to do it in a Synod of that Province, where the Biſhop lived, which was the regular Eccleſiaſtical Method; but might examine him by himſelf, or appoint his Privy Council, or an Inferior Magiſtrate to do it; or if he thought it proper to have him examined or tried by Biſhops, he might pick out or Name what Biſhops he thought fit for that purpoſe; for ſuch Trial would be only for the Emperor's Satisfaction, and enable him to judge whether he ſhould paſs a civil judicial Sentence upon him or not; as whether he ſhould condemn him to Fine, Impriſonment, Baniſhment or Death, or any other Temporal Puniſhment which the Civil Magiſtrate only can inflict. And when a Civil Magiſtrate is applied to on ſuch Occaſions, he muſt inform himſelf in the Matter by ſuch Methods as he thinks beſt, and is no more tied up by Eccleſiaſtical Rules in the Caſe of a Biſhop, than in the Caſe of any other Man. Now the Complaints againſt *Athanaſius*, which were made to *Conſtantine*, and for the Examination of which, he called a Council of the Eaſtern Biſhops, and ordered them to aſſemble at *Tyre*, (which is the caſe particularly referred to by the Queriſt) were of this ſort. (t) They firſt accuſed *Athanaſius* of levying Money in *Egypt* for the uſe of one that was going about to uſurp the Empire; for which *Athanaſius* was immediately ſummoned to *Conſtantinople*, heard and tried by the Emperor himſelf, and being acquitted, was ſent back to his Dioceſe. Then he was accuſed of cutting off a Man's Hand, of getting a Wench with Child, and other Matters, which deſerved not only a Spiritual

(t) Theod. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *cap.* 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31.

Cenſure, but to be corrected by the Secular Judge, if they could be proved: Theſe things *Conſtantine* ordered to be tried before the Council of *Tyre*, where *Athanaſius* alſo cleared himſelf, by ſhewing that the Man whom he was accuſed to have maimed, had both his Hands ſafe and ſound. And when the Wench who pretended he had got her with Child came to give her Evidence againſt him, it appeared that ſhe knew him not, and calling another Man by his Name, charged that Man with it. Then *Athanaſius* went to the Emperor to ſatisfy him concerning theſe Matters; and there his Adverſaries brought a new Accuſation againſt him, as that he had prohibited the Carriage of Corn from *Egypt* to *Conſtantinople*. The Emperor hearing this, and believing it, without any further Examination of the Matter, baniſhed *Athanaſius* to *Treves* in *Gallia*. Now what was there in all this but a meer Civil or Secular Judicature, which undoubtedly belonged to the Emperor? And he might try ſuch Cauſes in what manner he thought fit.

§ XLVII. But then it is asked, *Did not the Emperor* Gratian *in the fourth Century, when the ſlowneſs of Proceedings by Synods, was become a Grievance, ordain by his Civil Authority, that* Damaſus *Biſhop of* Rome, *and any five or ſeven Biſhops with him, ſhould be ſufficient for depoſing of Biſhops? And did not the* Roman *Synod then ſitting readily accept that Conſtitution?* Now, for my part, 'till I ſee a Subſtantial Proof of this pretended Ordinance of *Gratian*, (but it is not the Buſineſs of a Queriſt to prove any thing) I ſhall ſay that Emperor never made any ſuch Decree, nor was there any Council of *Rome* that accepted it. But this I do find, (*u*) That as ſoon as *Gratian*, upon the Death of his Uncle *Valens*, came to the Poſſeſſion of

(u) Theod. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 5. c. 2.

the

the whole Empire, he thought fit to take the Catholick Church which *Valens* had perſecuted into his Protection. And foraſmuch as *Valens* had baniſhed almoſt all the Catholick Biſhops within his Part of the Empire, or at leaſt put them out of the Poſſeſſion of their Churches, *Gratian* thought proper to reſtore the Catholick Biſhops to thoſe Poſſeſſions out of which they had been unjuſtly ejected. And foraſmuch as all the Catholick Biſhops were known to be of one Communion, and to hold no Communion with the *Arians*, or any other Hereticks or Schiſmaticks: Therefore whoever held Communion with a Catholick Biſhop was eſteemed to be a Catholick himſelf by all Perſons: For this Reaſon, that the Governors of the ſeveral Provinces of the Empire might know to what Biſhops they were to give Poſſeſſion, he made a Law by which *he order'd all the ejected Paſtors to return from Baniſhment, and that they ſhould be reſtored to their Flocks; and that the Holy Churches ſhould be delivered to ſuch as embraced the Communion of* Damaſus. This is the whole Decree of the Emperor *Gratian* that I can find concerning this Matter; not a Word of *Damaſus* or *any five or ſeven Biſhops with him to depoſe a Biſhop*; not a Word of *any* Roman *Synod ſitting at that Time, and accepting this Conſtitution*; that is all Dream and Fiction. And now what is there in all that *Gratian* did but what is purely ſecular, and belongs to the Civil Magiſtrate? and therefore he might proceed in it in ſuch a Way as liked him beſt. He neither made nor depoſed any Biſhop: He pretended not to take away the Relation between a Biſhop and his People, but only reſtored the rightful Paſtors to their proper Flocks, from which they had been baniſhed. And becauſe ſome might, upon this Imperial Favour, pretend to be Catholick Biſhops that really were not ſo, what better Rule could he give the Governors of his Provinces on this Occaſion, than to direct them to reſtore ſuch Biſhops as were

in the Communion of *Damasus*, the Catholick Bishop of the Imperial City? The Church even in the Reign of Heathen Emperors never pretended to eject Hereticks out of Houses, Lands or Edifices which they had got or kept Possession of, though they were such Things as were notoriously known to belong to the Church; (w) as we learn from the famous Case of *Paulus Samosatenus*: He being accused of Heresy, a Council was assembled to try and examine that Matter: They found him guilty, and accordingly deposed him and ordained *Domnus* in his *Room*. But *Paul* having Possession of the Episcopal House would not quit it. Neither did the Bishops pretend that by their own Authority they could eject him from it: But they applied to the Emperor *Aurelian*, an Heathen, and not long after a Persecutor of the Church; and he ordered, that Possession should be given to him to whom the Bishop of *Rome* and the other *Bishops* of *Italy* should direct; which was done accordingly, and *Domnus* obtain'd the Possession. May it not now as well be asked, If *Aurelian*, an Heathen Emperor, did not authorize the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Bishops of *Italy* to depose the Bishop of *Antioch*, as to ask if *Gratian* did not authorize *Damasus*, and Five or Seven Bishops more to depose any Bishop? But the plain Answer is, That the Bishop was deposed and the Communion settled in a regular Ecclesiastical Method according to Divine Institution, before *Aurelian* was applied to in the Case. And then when he was to judge concerning the Right of Possession, he took such a Method for examining the Merits of the Cause (as far as he was concerned in it) as to him seemed most proper. And if *Aurelian* would have given no Judgment at all, or had given a wrong Judgment, and confirmed *Paulus* in his unjust Posses-

(w) *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 7. c. 30.*

sion,

ſion, this would have made no Alteration in the Matter of Communion. Thoſe that had communicated with *Domnus*, would have been the *Catholicks*, and thoſe who had adhered to *Paulus*, the Schiſmaticks, which way ſoever the Emperor had judged. And ſo it was in the Caſe of *Gratian* the Chriſtian Emperor. His Decree did not make the *Orthodox* of the true Communion, nor the *Arians* of the falſe one. The *Orthodox* were as much the true Communion under *Valens*, who perſecuted and ejected them, as they were under *Gratian* that reſtored and protected them. The different Edicts of theſe two Emperors made no Difference in this Caſe. And the *Arians* were as much Hereticks and Schiſmaticks under an *Arian* Emperor, who gave them Poſſeſſion of the Churches, as they were under an Orthodox Emperor, who ejected them out of the Churches. And the Caſe was the ſame here under Queen *Elizabeth*, which is the next Query I ſhall conſider.

§. XLVIII. It is asked, *Was the Church of* England *Schiſmatick under Queen* Elizabeth, *when ſhe in Parliament deprived ſeveral Biſhops for not acknowledging her Supremacy? Did even the* Roman Catholicks *that queſtioned the Queen's Title at that Time or afterwards on that Score of depriving the Biſhops ſeparate from the eſtabliſhed Prayers? Were the Acts of the Biſhops that filled the Sees of the deprived Biſhops Invalid, or their Ordinations under this imagined Schiſm null?* But I deſire the Queriſt to inform me who imagines that there was any Schiſm made at that Time? And I ſhall anſwer in direct Terms, That *the Church of* England *was not ſchiſmatick under Queen* Elizabeth, *though ſhe and her Parliament deprived ſeveral Biſhops for not acknowledging her Supremacy.* And therefore *the Acts of the Biſhops that filled the Sees of the deprived Biſhops were not Invalid or Null in any reſpect.* And as to what the *Roman Catholicks* did upon that Occaſion, I think our Cauſe

not

not at all concerned in the Case. If they were guilty of any Inconsistency in their Actings, what is that to those who are not of their Communion? I shall therefore proceed to consider this Case more particularly without any Regard to the Compliances of the *Romanists* in the first Year of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign; for none of them that we read of came to the Publick Prayers after the Tenth Year of her Reign. But if they had all come to them even to this Day, what is it to the Purpose? Are we that have solemnly renounced *Popery* and all the Corruptions of the *Romish* Church to be directed by the Practice of those who continue in that Communion? No, it is the Scriptures and the Practice of the truly Primitive Church founded on the Scriptures that must be our Guide in this as well as other Matters. But I suppose this Querist would have the World think that all who are for the Independency of the Church upon the State are Favourers of the Church of *Rome*. Whereas it was the Church of *Rome* which first destroyed the true Primitive Independency of the Church, and let in the *Regale* upon it, that by joining with the Princes of the World to suppress the Power of other Bishops, they might raise the *Pontificate* or Power of the *Roman* Bishop to an higher Pitch than it could have obtain'd by any other Means. And were the Church restored to her true Primitive Independency, Popery must fall of Course. For Popery is built on the Destruction of Provincial Synods, which was the highest standing Authority of the Church, till the Patriarchs first, and then the Popes usurped upon them.

But to return to the Affair of Queen *Elizabeth*. The *English* Church having long groaned under the Papal Tyranny which had, by gradual Methods, been permitted to usurp upon the Rights of all the *Bishops* of the *West*, as well as upon Princes, the Bishops of this Realm in the Reign of King *Hen-*

*ry*

*ry* VIII. joined with that Prince to caſt off that Yoke ſo contrary to the original Rights and Privileges of all Provincial or National Churches, and to renounce that Obedience which the Pope, contrary to the Laws of God and Man, had exacted from them. They found, that in the Primitive Church all Provincial Churches were ſo far independent upon each other as to own no Superiority of one Provincial Church or Metropolitan above another; but Matters were finally determined in the Synod of each Province, and they held a fraternal Communion without any other Subordination, than that of the Suffragans of each Province to their reſpective Metropolitans or Archbiſhops; that when they met in larger Synods, as they ſometimes did, it was in a Fraternal way; and though at ſuch Times it was uſual to give the Primacy of Honour or Place to the Biſhop of the greateſt See, ſuch as at that Time were *Rome*, *Antioch* and *Alexandria*; yet this gave them no Juriſdiction over other Metropolitans or their Synods; nor was any Province bound by the Decrees of thoſe larger Synods any further than they had bound themſelves by their Delegates whom they had ſent thither to conſent for them, or afterwards freely received them. This, when Learning began to revive, our Biſhops diſcovered, and therefore juſtly refuſed to allow the Pope or any other foreign Biſhop any Juriſdiction in this Realm, though they ſeemed not unwilling to have held a fraternal Communion with him, if that would have been accepted; but nothing but a Submiſſion to the pretended Juriſdiction of the See of *Rome* would ſatisfy the Pope, and that being juſtly denyed, the Communion was broke and a Schiſm formed. But the Schiſm is not to be laid to the Charge of the *Engliſh* Biſhops who only aſſerted their own Independent Right, and refuſed not a Fraternal Communion with the Pope, but he with them: So that from that Time the Pope

and

and his Adherents commenced Schismaticks with relation to the *English* Church, and the *Schism* must be charged upon him for refusing to communicate with this Church, only because she would no longer bear his Usurpations and Encroachments upon her Primitive Liberties. After this, upon further Enquiry into the Scriptures, and the Practice of the Primitive Church, our Bishops also found that many Errors and Corruptions both in Doctrine and Discipline had been introduced, these in the Reign of King *Edward* VI. thy took care to reform, endeavouring to reduce all to the true Primitive Pattern about the Time of the Council of *Nice*; and in all Probability had reduced it exactly to that Plan if they would have depended on their own Learning and Judgment, and had not sent for *Martyr* and *Bucer* to consult with on this Occasion. However, as it was, 'twas a very good Reformation, and brought this Church nearer to the Primitive than any Church at that time or now in the World. And though I conceive, that it has some Defects, and might be made more Primitive; yet it has all Things necessary to Salvation. But this Reformation of our Church more enraged the *Papists*, who instead of being brought to a Sight of their Errors by it and to the Correction of them, became more obstinate and confirm'd all their Corruptions and Errors in the Council of *Trent*, making them also Articles of Faith, and thereby adding Heresy to their Schism. So that our *English* Church became the only Church in this Part of the World with which a Man could safely communicate, all the rest having either no Bishops to be the Centres of Unity and Communion, as the Reformed abroad, both *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, or only such Bishops as were both *Heretical* and *Schismatical* as the *Papists*, who refused Communion with us meerly because we thought proper to cast off the Papal

pal Usurpation, and those corrupt Novelties they had introduced, and resolved to be guided by the Scriptures and Practice of the Primitive Church. When Queen *Mary* came to the Crown she turned out the Catholick and Orthodox Bishops which her Brother King *Edward* left in Possession of the Bishopricks. Some of these, as *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer*, *Hooper* and *Farrar*, she condemned to the Flames; others, as *Barlow*, *Scory*, and *Coverdale*, she forced to fly to save their Lives. But it was the Catholick, Orthodox reformed Bishops that were still the rightful Bishops of the Church of *England*, and the Bishops with whom the Martyrs of that Reign held Communion and owned for their Bishops. The Popish Bishops, though possessed of the publick Churches and Revenues, and under the Protection of the State, were nevertheless the Schismaticks as well as Hereticks who intruded into the Sees of the Catholick and Orthodox Bishops. So that when Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown, and with the Consent of her Parliament turned out the Popish Bishops and restored the Catholick Orthodox Bishops to their Flocks: She acted but as a good Prince ought to do, restoring and protecting the true Bishops and the true Religion, and ejecting and discouraging false Bishops and false Religion. And had Queen *Elizabeth* still continued the Popish Bishops in their several Bishopricks as Queen *Mary* did, no true Catholick and Orthodox *Christian* who held fast to the Communion of the truly Primitive, Catholick, and Apostolick Church of *Christ*, to which Communion our reformed Bishops had returned, could have communicated with them without Sin, both as they were Schismatical by intruding into full Sees, or had joyned Communion with those that did so, and as the Terms of Communion which they imposed upon their Spiritual Subjects, were sinful, and such as could not be lawfully complied with. So that when Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown she did not make the

Bishop-

Bishopricks vacant, but found them so as to all Spiritual Power; for an Heretick or Schismatick cannot fill a Bishop's See though he get Possession of it. But she found several Heretical and Schismatical Bishops possessed of the Temporalties of the *English* Bishopricks, and that she and her Parliament deprived them of, and put Catholick and Orthodox Bishops into them. And we all agree, that Possession of Temporalties, when unjustly and forceably detained from the right Owners, must be given by the Civil Magistrate, who alone has the Power to do Right to those that suffer Wrong in such Cases. And the Primitive *Christians* allowed this even to Heathen Princes, that they alone could forceably eject such as had gotten a wrongful Possession of the Temporalties of a Church, as we have seen before in the Case of *Paulus Samosatenus*, when they applied to the Emperor *Aurelian* to eject him out of the Episcopal House at *Antioch*.

§ XLIX. But then it is further asked, *If Schism renders* the Administration of all Ministerial Offices ineffectual, *and if the Pretensions of more than one to the same See makes a Schism, what shall be said for the Orders of the* English, *and indeed of the whole* Western *Church, which were received from Bishops in Communion with* Antipopes *who kept up a Schism for seventy Years together? Were the People all this Time, and since, deprived of all Benefit of Divine Ordinances without their Fault?* To this it may be answered, That Orders given and received in Schism, though ineffectual for that Time, as S. *Paul* teaches, that all Gifts and Graces are, where Charity is wanting, which cannot be had in Schism, for the Apostle particularly applies it to that Case; yet are not therefore wholly Null and Invalid; and consequently when the Schism is healed, and the Schismaticks returned to Catholick Communion, the Orders given and received in Schism become effectual also; and the same may be said of the Administration of other Ministerial Offices. And therefore,

fore those who received their Orders from Antipopes or from Bishops in Communion with Antipopes, upon their Return to the true Communion, became rightful Bishops and Priests and their Ministrations then became effectual, though they were not so before. This Schism therefore though it continued seventy Years; yet being at last healed, and both Parties joined in one Communion, the Orders on both Sides, and all other Ministerial Offices became effectual. And this sufficiently secures the Orders of the *English*, and would do so of the whole *Western* Church, if the other Parts of the *Western* Church had not since made a New Schism by refusing and rejecting the *English* Church, and thrusting her out of their Communion, because she judged it necessary to return to the Catholick Communion of the truly Apostolick Primitive Church, and to reform those Errors and Corruptions which had sully'd and defaced her ancient Purity. And for this Reason, though we cannot communicate with a Popish Bishop or Priest, and look upon his Ministrations as effectual; yet if he shall renounce his Errors and return to the true Catholick Communion of the Church of *England*, we receive him as a *Bishop* or *Priest* without giving him any new Ordination; nor have we then any Doubt of the Effect of his Ministrations. Thus *Anthony Kitchin*, the Schismatical Popish Bishop of *Llandaff*, in Queen *Mary*'s Reign, upon his coming over to the Catholick Communion of the Church of *England* in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, was received and acknowledged as a true Catholick Bishop by all the Bishops of this Realm, and enjoyed his Bishoprick to his dying Day. So the Archbishop of *Spalato*, a Popish Bishoprick in *Dalmatia*, under the Government of the *Venetians*, coming hither and declaring himself to be of our Communion, was received as a Bishop, (*x*) being admitted to assist

(*x*) Heylin's *Life of Archbishop* Laud. *p.* 107.

Arch-

Archbiſhop *Abbot* at the Conſecration of ſome *Engliſh* Biſhops in the Chapel at *Lambeth*. This is agreeable to the Practice of the ancient Church with relation to the *Novatians*, *Donatiſts*, *Arians*, and other Hereticks or Schiſmaticks. Thus the Council of *Nice* (*y*) decreed as to the *Novatians*, who had then kept up a Schiſm in the Church above ſixty Years, and continued it 150 Years more, calling themſelves by the Name of *Puritans*. I will give it according to the Learned Mr. *Johnſon*'s Tranſlation in the *Vade-Mecum*. *As to thoſe who call themſelves Puritans, if they come over to the Catholick and Apoſtolick Church, the Holy Synod Decrees, that they* who are ordain'd ſhall continue in the Clergy; *having firſt profeſſed in Writing, that they will adhere to the Decrees of the Catholick Church; that is, that they will communicate with thoſe that have married a ſecond Time, and ſuch as have lapſed under Perſecution. When none but they are found to be ordain'd in any City or Village, they ſhall remain in the ſame Order; but if any come over where there is a Biſhop or Prieſt of the Catholick Church, 'tis clear, that the Biſhop of the Church ought to retain his Dignity; and he that had been named Biſhop by the Puritans, ſhall have the Honour of a Prieſt; unleſs the Biſhop think fit to impart to him the Nominal Honour of a Biſhop: Otherwiſe he ſhall provide for him the Place of a Village-Biſhop or Prieſt; that ſo there may not be two Biſhops in one City.* The *Novatians* differed not at all from the Catholicks in their Form of Government or of Divine Worſhip, only in two Points of Diſcipline here mentioned, they would allow none to continue in their Communion who had marry'd a ſecond Time, or who had lapſed or renounced the Chriſtian Faith in Time of Perſecution, ſuch as theſe they would not receive even upon Repentance, which the Catholick Church did: And therefore the Church required no more of them than to promiſe, under their Hand-Writing,

(*y*) Concil. Nicæn. Can. 8.

that

that they would conform in these Particulars. But their Schism was formed as has been before shewed by their putting other Bishops into full Sees, and therefore the Council took particular Care of that Matter; and though it allowed their Orders to be good upon their Return to the Unity of the Church and relinquishing their Schism, and gave them leave to keep Possession of such Bishopricks as they had got where no Catholick Bishop could claim against them, yet they could not allow a *Novatian* Bishop to continue to be Bishop of such a See as had a Catholick Bishop before such a *Novatian* returned to the Communion of the Church. In that Case they allowed him to act only as a Presbyter under the Catholick Bishop, though he might retain the Nominal Honour of a Bishop, and so precede all the other Presbyters: Or might be appointed Bishop of a Village, there to perform such Episcopal Acts as the Bishop of the City should intrust him to perform, and for which he should be accountable to the Bishop of the City who was to be esteemed his Superior, and without whose Commission he should perform no Episcopal Act, that so there might not be two Bishops, the one of which depended not upon or owed no Subjection to the other, in one City. The Council therefore plainly allowed the Orders given and received in the *Novatian* Schism to be good and such as needed not to be repeated, though their Schism or Breach of Charity made them ineffectual or unprofitable so long as they continued in Schism. But when that Breach was healed by their Return to the Unity of the Church, then their Orders also became effectual and profitable as if that Breach had not been. So it was also in the Case of the *Donatists* who had made a Schism just as the *Novatians* had done before them, by putting Bishops into full Sees. For thus the (z) *A-*

(z) Can. 68. aliter 71.

*frican* Council decreed, whose Canons were after received into the Code of the Universal Church, which I will also give according to the Reverend and Learned Mr. *Johnson*'s Translation and Abridgment: *That Letters be sent to our Fellow-Bishops, and especially to the Apostolical See, in which our venerable Brother and Collegue* Anastasius *presides, to let them know that we receive those who were Clergy-men among the* Donatists, *upon their Conversion, with the same Honour that they enjoyed among the* Donatists, *if the Bishop of the Place think fit, according to the Custom of the Church of* Africk, *although by a Transmarine Council, which we do not pretend to annull, the contrary has been ordered.* Whether Heretical or Schismatical Clergy-men should be admitted as *Bishops*, *Priests* or *Deacons*, according to the Station they were in amongst their own Party, or whether they should only be admitted to Lay-Communion upon their Return to the Church, was a Matter of Discipline; wherein the Church acted as she judged most expedient and prudential. For though Hereticks and Schismaticks had true Orders, yet the Church might receive such as had those Orders to Lay-Communion only, even as she might reduce a Catholick Bishop or Priest to Lay-Communion, for such Crimes as she should judge to deserve that Punishment. And so they dealt with the *Donatists*: they left the Bishop of the Place to judge whether he would receive them as Laicks or as Clerks. And though a Transmarine Council had not left that Liberty to the Bishops of the Province where that Council was held, that is no Argument that even that Council did not think them to have true Orders, only they did not think it proper that Men who had long and obstinately persisted in such a grievous Sin, and been such implacable Enemies to the Catholick Church, should immediately be allowed to possess the highest Honours in the Church: But should at least continue some time in Lay-Communion,

nion, to give the fuller Teſtimony of the Sincerity of their Converſion. For we never find that any Converts from *Donatiſm*, who had been ordained in that Schiſm were ever after required to be re-ordained. When or whereſoever they were admitted into the Number of the Catholick Clergy, they were always admitted without a new Ordination. So S. *Auguſtine* (a) tells *Parmenian* the *Donatiſt* Biſhop, ſaying, *For whenſoever Biſhops and Presbyters coming over from that Party are received for Peace-ſake upon renouncing their Error, and it ſeem proper that they ſhould execute the ſame Functions they performed before, they are not again ordained; but as their Baptiſm, ſo their Ordination remains entire: Becauſe the Fault was in the Schiſm, which is corrected by a Return to Peace and Unity; not in the Sacraments, which whereſoever they be are the ſame.* And we learn from S. *Jerome*'s Dialogue with the *Luciferian*, that the only Reaſon why *Lucifer* and his Party ſeparated from the *Catholick Church* was, becauſe the *Catholick Church* received *Arian* Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, as Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons of the Catholick Church upon their Converſion without any Re-Ordination, although the *Arians* were Hereticks as well as Schiſmaticks. And yet theſe Ancients who thus allowed the Validity of Schiſmatical or Heretical Ordinations and Baptiſms, held them to be ineffectual and unprofitable to Salvation. S. *Auguſtine*, who was preſent in that Council of *Carthage* above cited, where it was decreed, that the *Donatiſt* Clergy might be received as Clergy-men upon their

(a) Nam ſi quando ex ipſa parte venientes etiam præpoſiti pro bono pacis correcto Schiſmatis errore ſuſcepti ſunt, & ſi viſum eſt opus eſſe ut eadem Officia gererent quæ gerebant, non ſunt rurſum ordinati; ſed ſicut Baptiſmus in eis, ita ordinatio manſit integra: quia in Præciſione fuerat vitium, quod in Unitatis pace correctum eſt; non in Sacramentis, quæ ubicunque ſunt, ipſa ſunt. *Auguſt. contr. Epiſt. Parmen.* L. 2. c. 13. §. 28.

coming over to the Catholick Church, and alſo in ſeveral Parts of his Works, declares it to have been the Practice of the Church, one of which Paſſages I have already quoted, yet maintained and proved that this did not render their Miniſtrations operative and effectual ſo long as they continued in Schiſm. This the *Donatiſts* took Advantage of, and argued thus; *If our Orders are good and our Baptiſm good, ſo that upon our coming over to you they need not be repeated, then our Miniſtrations are not ineffectual and unoperative, as you pretend. And ſince you do not rebaptize nor re-ordain any that go over from our Communion to yours, you plainly allow theſe Miniſtrations at leaſt to be effectual, otherwiſe you would repeat them. And if theſe Miniſtrations are effectual, then all our Miniſtrations are ſo, and conſequently Salvation is to be obtained in our Communion, which is the Thing you deny.* The Subject of S. *Auguſtine*'s Books againſt the *Donatiſts* concerning Baptiſm ſeems chiefly deſigned to clear this Point. But there is one Paſſage which does it demonſtratively, which though pretty long, yet I think proper to tranſcribe, becauſe it gives an effectual Anſwer to the Query now under Conſideration, and ſhews, that though the Miniſtrations of Schiſmaticks are ineffectual whilſt they continue in Schiſm; yet Orders derived from Schiſmaticks are not therefore Null and Invalid, nor the Miniſtration of Perſons ſo ordained ineffectual upon their Return to the Unity of the Church. (*b*) *I will*, ſays he, *produce ſome Arguments out of the Goſpel, with which, by the Lord's Help, I demonſtrate, how it is rightly and truly pleaſing to*

(*b*) Ex Evangelio profero certa documenta, quibus Domino adjuvante demonſtro, quam rectè placuerit & vere ſecundum Deum, & hoc in quoquam Schiſmatico vel Hæretico Eccleſiaſtica Medicina curaret, in quo vulnere ſeperabatur; illud autem quod ſanum maneret, agnitum potius approbaretur, quam

*to God, that the Eccleſiaſtical Medicine ſhould cure every Schiſmatick or Heretick of that Wound by which he was ſeparated; but that which remained ſound and good being known to be ſo ſhould rather be approved, than that it ſhould be wounded by being diſapproved. Surely the Lord ſays in the Goſpel,* † He that is not with me is againſt me; and he that gathereth not with me, ſcattereth abroad. *Yet when the Diſciples told him* * *that* they ſaw one caſting out Devils in his Name, and forbad him becauſe he followed not with them: He ſaid, Forbid him not: For he that is not againſt us is for us. For there is no Man which ſhall do a Miracle in my Name that can lightly ſpeak Evil of me. *If there was nothing to be corrected in him, then every one is ſecure, who being out of the Communion of the Church gathers in Chriſt's Name, being diſ-joined from the Chriſtian Society: And ſo that ſhall be falſe,* He that is not with me is againſt me; and he that gathereth not with me ſcattereth abroad. *But if that which our Lord's Diſciples would have done through Ignorance, was to be corrected in him; upon which our Lord ſaid,* Forbid him not: *Why did he prohibit him to be forbidden? And how ſhall that be true which he there ſays,* He that is not againſt us is for us? *For in this Matter he was not againſt them but for them, when he cured Diſeaſes in the Name*

---

quam improbatum vulneraretur. Certe Dominus in Evangelio dicit, qui non eſt mecum adverſus me eſt, & qui mecum non colligit, ſpargit. Tamen cùm ad eum diſcipuli retuliſſent, vidiſſe ſe quendam in ejus nomine pellentem dæmonia, & prohibuiſſe, quia cùm illis eum non ſequebatur: Nolite, inquit, prohibere; Qui contra vos non eſt, pro vobis eſt. Non poteſt enim quiſquam in meo nomine facere aliquid, & male loqui de me. Si nihil in illo corrigendum erat; ſecurus ergo ſit quiſquis extra Communionem Eccleſiæ conſtitutus colligit in Chriſti nomine, diſſociatus a Chriſtiana Societate: Atque ita falſum erit illud, Qui non eſt mecum, adverſum me eſt; Auguſt. *de Baptiſm. contra* Donatiſtas *lib.* 1. *cap.* 7, 8, 9.

† *Matt.* xii. 30. * *Luk.* ix. 49, 50. *and Mark* ix. 38, 39.

*of* Christ. *That therefore both Sayings may be true, as well that, where he says,* He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad; *as that, where he says,* Forbid him not, for he that is not against us is for us: *What remains to be understood, but that he was to be confirmed in his Veneration of so great a Name, wherein he was not against the Church, but for the Church; and yet to be blamed in that Separaration, wherein if he gathered he scattered abroad; and if by chance he came to the Church, he should not there receive what he had already, but should amend that wherein he had erred? For the Prayers of* Cornelius *an* Heathen *were heard and his Alms accepted: And he even obtained the Favour to have an Angel sent to him, and being sent to see him, and from whom he might, without any Man's coming, have learned all Things necessary. But because whatever there was good in his Prayers and Alms, unless by the Bands of Christian Society and Peace he was incorporated into the Church, could not profit him; he is commanded to send for* Peter, *and by him he learns* Christ; *by him he is also baptized, and is also joined to the Christian People by the Band of Communion, to which he was joined only in the Similitude of good Works. For it would have been pernicious to him to have despised the Good which he yet had not, being proud of that which he had. So also those who separating themselves from the Society of the Rest, by the Violation of Charity break the Band of Unity, if they do none of those Things which they received in that Society, they are separate in all Things: And therefore whomsoever they have associated to them, if he would come into the Church, he ought to receive all that he has not received. But if they do some of the same Things, they have not separated in those Matters; they are yet joined in that Part, in the other they are cut off. Therefore if they join any one to themselves, he is in that Part joined to the Church in which they are not separated from it: And therefore if he would come into the Church, he is to be healed in that where being torn from it he erred: But*

*where he was found, and joined to it, he is not cured, but acknowledged; leſt when we would cure that which is well already, we ſhould rather give a Wound. Therefore thoſe whom they* (the Donatiſts) *baptize, they cure of the Wound of Idolatry or Infidelity; but they ſtrike him deeper with the Wound of Schiſm. For* † *thoſe that were Idolaters amongſt God's People were ſlain but with the Sword:* * *But the Earth opened and ſwallowed up the Schiſmaticks alive.* ‖ *And the Apoſtle ſays,* Though I have all Faith, ſo that I could remove Mountains, and have not Charity, I am nothing. *If any one is brought to a Phyſician grievouſly wounded in any Vital Part of his Body, if the Phyſician ſhall ſay, he muſt die unleſs this be cured, I do not ſuppoſe that they which brought him will be ſo fooliſh as to count and number up his other Parts which are ſound, and ſay, Then are not ſo many ſound Parts ſufficient to ſave his Life, and yet that one wounded one is enough to kill him? They ſay not ſo, but bring him to be cured; neither becauſe they bring him to be cured, do they ask the Phyſician to cure thoſe Parts which are ſound; but that he would immediately apply a Remedy to that one Place from whence Death is at hand, though all the other Members are whole, and unleſs that be cured Death will come. What then does it profit a Man to have a ſound Faith, or perhaps only a ſound Sacrament of Faith, when the Soundneſs of his Charity is deſtroyed by the deadly Wound of Schiſm, by the ſole Deſtruction of which thoſe whole Parts are drawn into Death? Which that it may not be, the Mercy of God fails not, but has provided that though the Unity of his holy Church they may come and be healed by the Medicine of Reconciliation through the Bond of Peace. Neither let them therefore think themſelves ſound, becauſe we ſay that they have ſomething ſound: Nor again let them think that therefore that is to be cured which is ſound, becauſe we have ſhewed there is ſomething that is wounded. Therefore in the Soundneſs of the Sacrament, becauſe they are not againſt us they are for us: But in the Wound*

† *Exod.* xxxii. 28. * *Num.* xvi. 32. ‖ 1 *Cor.* xiii. 2.

*of Schism, because they are not with Christ they scatter abroad. Why do they proudly look only upon those Things that are sound? Let them also humbly observe their Wound, and not regard only that which they have, but that which they want. Let them see how many and how great Things profit not, if one certain Thing be wanting, and let them see what that one Thing is; neither let them hear me, but the Apostle.* † Though, *says he*, I speak with the the Tongues of Men and of Angels, and have not Charity, I am become as sounding Brass or a tinkling Cymbal. And though I have the Gift of Prophecy, and understand all Mysteries, and all Knowledge, and though I have all Faith, so that I could remove Mountains, and have not Charity, I am nothing. *What then does it profit them though they have an Angelick Voice in sacred Mysteries, or even the Gift of Prophecy, as* Caiaphas *and* Saul, *as those may sometimes prophecy whom the Scriptures witness to have been in a damnable State? If they not only know the Sacraments, but have them as* Simon Magus *had: If they have Faith, as the Devils confessed* Christ; *For they were not unbelieving when they said,* * What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God, we know who thou art. *If they give all their Substance to the Poor, as many not only in the Catholick Church, but in divers Heresies do. If upon the arising of any Persecution they deliver their Body with us to the Flames, for the Faith which they likewise profess; yet because they do these things in Separation, not suffering together in Love, nor studying to preserve the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace, therefore having not Charity, even all those Things cannot profit them, and they shall not attain to eternal Life.* This Holy Father has here shewn the Reasonableness of the Churches proceeding in this Case with regard to Hereticks and Schismaticks, that although she allowed the Validity

† 1 *Cor.* xiii. 1, 2. * *Mark* i. 24.

of

of their Orders and Baptiſm and other Miniſtrations which they had in common with the *Catholick Church*; yet ſhe denied that theſe could be effectual to Salvation in Hereſy or Schiſm, becauſe there was one Thing wanting, and that was *Charity*, without which the Apoſtle has taught us, that all things elſe are nothing worth. And the ſame Apoſtle has alſo taught us, that this Charity conſiſts in preſerving the Unity of the Church, which is always broken by Hereſy and Schiſm. And the ſetting up one Biſhop in Oppoſition to another, or putting a new Biſhop into a Biſhoprick already poſſeſſed by a Catholick Biſhop, was ever called a Schiſm, becauſe it divided the Flock from the Communion of their rightful Biſhop with whom they ought to be always in Communion. And the Schiſm at *Corinth*, as I have ſhewed plainly, aroſe from ſome Mens coming in there and drawing away the People from the Communion of S. *Paul* their rightful Biſhop; in other Matters, for ought appears to the contrary, they were Orthodox enough. And this *Schiſm* of the *Donatiſts* which S. *Auguſtine* wrote againſt, aroſe only from the ſetting up *Majorinus* to be Biſhop of *Carthage*, when that See was already filled by *Cecilian* the rightful Catholick Biſhop of that Church: As the *Novatian* Schiſm began at *Rome* by putting *Novatian* into that See, whilſt it was filled by *Cornelius* the Catholick Biſhop. And the Church plainly had S. *Paul*'s Authority, or rather the Authority of the Holy Ghoſt to declare, that *the Miniſtration of Divine Offices in ſuch Schiſmatical Communions was ineffectual, that is, unprofitable to Salvation*, notwithſtanding the Orders and Sacraments were in all other Reſpects valid and regular, and therefore needed not to be repeated upon their Reconciliation to Catholick Communion; and therefore whether our Orders are derived from Schiſmaticks or Catholicks, it Matters not, ſo as we be in Catholick Communion.

§. L. But

§ L. But says the Queriſt, *There was a Schiſm kept up in the Weſtern Church for ſeventy Years together; were the People all this Time and ſince deprived of all Benefit of Divine Ordinances, without their Fault?* Now as to the Time *ſince*, I have ſufficiently anſwered it already; for the *Schiſm* being healed, the Word and Sacraments were rightly and duly adminiſtred by all the Biſhops and Prieſts of both Parties, whether they had been *Schiſmatical* or not; I mean as to any Deficiency or Ineffectualneſs occaſioned by the *Schiſm*. But the other Queſtion ſtill remains, *Were the People, for ſeventy Years together, during the Time that Schiſm laſted, deprived of all Benefit of Divine Ordinances, without their Fault?* Now the ſame Queſtion might be asked with Regard to the *Novatian* and *Donatiſt* Schiſms which continued more than ſeventy Years. For the *Novatian* Schiſm began about the Year 251, when *Novatian* was put into the See of *Rome* in Oppoſition to *Cornelius* the rightful Biſhop, and did not end till after 440, where *Socrates* finiſhes his Hiſtory, during which Time he gives us a Catalogue of the *Novatian* Biſhops at *Conſtantinople* in a conſtant Succeſſion one to another, and how long they continued afterwards we do not find. The *Donatiſt* Schiſm began about the Year 311, when *Majorinus* was made Biſhop of *Carthage* in Oppoſition to *Cecilian* the rightful Biſhop, who was before legally poſſeſſed of that Chair, and continued till after the Conference at *Carthage* in the Year 411. So that one of theſe Schiſms continued two hundred Years at leaſt, and the other above an hundred Years. Theſe Schiſms were formed purely upon the ſetting up Anti-Biſhops in Oppoſition to the Rightful Biſhops, who were before legally poſſeſſed of their Biſhopricks, and whom no regular Epiſcopal Synod had judged to have fallen from their Biſhopricks by Tranſgreſſion. *Novatian* alſo, and his Party, was (as I have before

before ſhewed) ſupported by *Gallus* and *Voluſianus*, the Emperors at that Time, who baniſhed *Cornelius* and *Lucius*, one after the other, the Rightful Biſhops of *Rome*, and left *Novatian* in the ſole Poſſeſſion. The *Donatiſts* alſo, (*c*) as we learn from *Optatus*, who has given us the fulleſt Account of the Riſe and Progreſs of that *Schiſm*, were ſo ſupported by the Emperor *Julian*, that they drove away the Catholick Biſhops in divers Places, invaded their Churches, and kept Poſſeſſion of them. What ſhould the People do in theſe Caſes? The Catholick Biſhops were driven away by the Sovereign Imperial Authority without their Fault? They could not have the Word and Sacraments from Catholick Biſhops and their Preſbyters, but privately and with great Danger; but they might have them from the *Novatians* or *Donatiſts* openly and without any Danger at all. The *Novatians* and the *Donatiſts* miniſtred them alſo juſt in the ſame Manner that the Catholicks did; there was no manner of Difference in their Liturgies or Forms of Worſhip; and the People could not help it that the Catholick Biſhops were diſabled from officiating among them. When therefore they received theſe Divine Ordinances from theſe Schiſmatical Biſhops, or their Prieſts, were thoſe Ordinances ineffectual to their Salvation? Were they deprived of the Benefit of them? The Church always held they were ſo, and that upon the Authority of the Scriptures, which teach us, as S. *Auguſtine* has obſerved, that Schiſm breaks the Band of Charity, and without Charity all Divine Ordinances whatſoever are unprofitable. But ſhall the People be deprived of this Benefit *without their Fault?* In anſwer to which it may be asked, how this can be *without their Fault?* Is it not their Fault, if they will join themſelves to Hereticks

(*c*) Optat. *contra* Parmenian. *lib.* 2.

or

or Schiſmaticks, and go to them for theſe Divine Ordinances, which it is is ſo plain they cannot effectually miniſter? It may be ſaid, perhaps, that they are ſo placed that they muſt receive them from ſuch Perſons, or not at all. Then let them not receive them at all: For it is no Sin if a Man receives not the Sacraments, who lies under an Impoſſibility of receiving them; as ſuppoſe a *Chriſtian* to be left alone in an Heathen Country, which has ſometimes happened, for many Years, will it be a Sin in him, or put him out of the State of Salvation, that he joins in no Publick Worſhip, nor receives the Holy Eucharift for ſuch a Number of Years, or may happen to die in that State? But it is a Sin to make or abet a Schiſm, and he that joins in Divine Ordinances with a *Schiſmatick* abets and encourages the *Schiſm*, and therefore is not deprived of the Benefit of thoſe Ordinances without his Fault. But it may be he knows not the Miniſter from whom he receives theſe Ordinances is a Schiſmatick. Then it is his Fault that he did not inform himſelf better: For Schiſm is a Thing of a Publick Nature in which any Man may eaſily inform and ſatisfy himſelf which is the Right. Thus for Inſtance, there was no Chriſtian at *Rome* but did, or at leaſt might know that *Cornelius* was the Rightful Biſhop, being lawfully poſſeſſed of the Biſhoprick, and conſecrated thereto after a conſiderable Vacancy which followed the Death of *Fabianus*: And that *Novatian* was not conſecrated nor appointed to be Biſhop till after the Epiſcopal Chair was regularly filled; conſequently that *Novatian* was the Schiſmatick, and not *Cornelius*, even though *Cornelius* was baniſhed by the Emperor, and *Novatian* left in the ſole Poſſeſſion, ſo far at leaſt that *Cornelius*'s Presbyters were forced to officiate in Private, not in the publick Churches for fear of the Emperor. However, there was no Man but might eaſily know whether he received Divine Ordinances from

from a Catholick or *Novatian* Presbyter, and conſequently whether he communicated with the Catholick or with the Schiſmatical Biſhop. So at *Carthage* the People all knew that *Cecilian* was their lawful Biſhop, and *Majorinus* an Intruder that got Poſſeſſion of the See when it was full before, conſequently could not but know which was the Schiſmatick: And when they received Divine Ordinances from any Presbyter, they could not but know whether he belonged to *Cecilian* or *Majorinus*; for they did not mix Communions ſo as to have it unknown to which Party any Presbyter belonged. And though one of theſe Schiſms continued above 200 Years, and the other above an hundred; yet during all that Time the Communions were diſtinct, (for had there been but one Communion there had been no Schiſm) and thoſe who received Divine Ordinances knew with whom they communicated; and therefore if they would notwithſtanding receive Divine Ordinances from the Hand of thoſe who could not effectually miniſter them to the Profit and Salvation of thoſe who received them, it cannot be ſaid that they were deprived of the Benefit of them without their own own Faults. And the like may be ſaid with relation to thoſe who lived in the Time of the Anti-Popes. If it be ſaid, that during the Time of ſo long a Schiſm as ſeventy, an hundred or two hundred Years, many Perſons muſt be born, who being educated in the Schiſm were, from their Infancy, taught to believe that to be the true Communion, who had not Means or Opportunities of enquiring into the Original of the Schiſm, and who hearing one Story from one Party, and another from the other Party, were unable to judge which was right and which was wrong: If they did continue in the Schiſmatical Communion, ſhall we ſay, that they were deprived of the Benefit of the Divine Ordinances when it is ſo apparent that it was not their own Faults?

Faults? It may be answered, That though this may mitigate or extenuate the Fault, yet it does not make it no Fault at all; for though it may be difficult for a Man that has been prejudiced by an unhappy Education to find the Truth, as having been so perswaded from the Beginning that he was in the Right, that perhaps he never made it a Question that possibly he might be in the wrong; yet this does not wholly excuse him if he should be in the Wrong, because he never made any Enquiry about it, or thought that he had Occasion to enquire. (*d*) Such a Person may possibly obtain Mercy, as S. *Paul* did, because what he does he does ignorantly. But our Saviour has taught us, That even Ignorance will not wholly excuse us in Matters relating to God, (*e*) *For that Servant which knows not his Lord's Will, and* therefore *does commit Things worthy of Stripes, shall be beaten,* though but *with few Stripes.* What Allowances God may make to those that are invincibly ignorant, or want Means of better Information, we cannot say; we may hope well indeed, but we have no Word of God to direct us: It is the Duty of Ministers of the Gospel to inform the Ignorant, but it is no Part of their Duty to tell them that they are safe in their Ignorance; if it was, it would be as well or better to let them continue Ignorant still, rather than trouble them with useless Knowledge; for it must be useless if they can be as safe without it. And indeed to ask, whether all who lived and died in Schism were utterly deprived of the Benefit of all Divine Ordinances is no other than an Invidious Question, which makes nothing to the Merits of the Cause. Thus, if I would convert an *Heathen*, and in order thereto should tell him, that unless he becomes a *Christian* he cannot be saved; (*f*) That *there is none other*

(d) 1 *Tim.* i. 13. (e) *Luke* xii. 48. (f) *Act.* iv. 12.

*Name*

*Name under Heaven given among Men whereby we must be saved, but only the Name of* Jesus Christ; *neither is there Salvation in any other.* And in Answer to it he should say, What are my Friends and Relations then damned, who lived and died in the Religion which I profess, and who, I am sure, led as good Lives, and were as just and honest in their Dealings as any Christians? Did all their good Works, their Prayers and their Alms avail them nothing, because they did not believe in *Jesus Christ*, which was none of their Fault, for they never heard of him? Are all those many Nations of the World, in which the Gospel was never preached, or at least has not been preached for many hundreds of Years, to be deprived of all Hopes of Happiness hereafter, because they believe not in *Christ*, although they were never informed that there was such a Person; and therefore you cannot charge this Unbelief upon them as a Fault? The same may be said of the *Jews* and *Mahometans*, many of which never had Opportunity to hear one Word of *Christ*, and these *Heathens*, *Jews* and *Mahometans* are much more numerous than all the Sects of *Christians* put together, and many of them as strict and exemplary in their Lives as the very best of *Christians*; and do you damn all these to the Pit of *Hell* for that which is not their own Fault? What would all this signify to the Merits of the Cause, whether the Christian is the only true Religion? If I can prove the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and can shew from those Scriptures that Salvation is to be obtained through *Jesus Christ* alone, then all these Questions are impertinent and nothing to the Purpose. And I should not scruple to tell an *Heathen* who should ask such Questions by way of Objection to the Truths of *Christianity*; That how merciful soever God might be to his Forefathers, or any other living and dying in *Heathenism*, who had no Means of better Information, and tho' I would not go about to limit

God's

God's Mercies upon any Occasion, yet if he obstinately refused Instruction, I should assure him, that it would be worse with him than with them, (*g*) because having the Means of *knowing his Lord's Will, yet he would not prepare himself, nor do according to his Will; and that therefore he should be beaten with many Stripes.* For how far soever invincible Ignorance may prove an Excuse for them, he is uncapable of making that Plea, since he might be better informed if he would. And the same might an *Orthodox Catholick Christian* have said to a *Novatian* or *Donatist*, or the Follower of an *Anti-Pope* when those Schisms were on Foot, if he had asked if the People of those Schismatical Communions were for seventy, an hundred, or two hundred Years deprived of the Benefit of Divine Ordinances without their Fault? That, whatever became of the People who neither did nor could know better, this would be no Excuse for him that had an Opportunity of being better informed. That S. *Paul* has taught us that *Schism* breaks the Bond of Charity, and that without Charity all our Doings are nothing worth; that this is the Rule we are to walk by, and that therefore where there is a Schism formed it behoves us to take heed that we adhere to the true Communion; for if we should happen to be of the Schismatical Side we break the Band of Charity, and then the Scriptures tell us the Consequence; and therefore it is impertinent to ask what is become of those who have died in the Schism, believing themselves to be in the Right, and who continued in it, as we may suppose, without Fault, because they knew no better. We must follow the Rule prescribed to us by the Scripture, and for those who deviate from that Rule, when they are gone hence they are gone to receive their Judgment from God,

(g) *Luke* xii. 47.

and

and to his Judgment we must leave them. But the Scripture Rule must be our Guide, and not the Practice of Men, how great an Opinion soever we may have of them. Neither must we be afraid of condemning *Schism*, because the *Schismaticks* may be the greater Number, or because they may have the secular Magistrate of their Side. The *Novatians* and the *Donatists* were, at some Times and in some Places, the most powerful Party, and had the Emperors of their Side, and yet were as much Schismaticks then as at any other Time. The *Arians*, during the Reigns of *Constantius* and *Valens*, that is above thirty Years, were the most numerous and powerful Party of Christians in the *East*, and the World seemed to be all of their Communion, yet were they no less Hereticks and Schismaticks under those Emperors than they were under *Gratian* and *Theodosius*, by whom they were cast out of the Possession of the publick Churches. So also in this Realm, the Papists were much the most numerous and powerful in the Reign of Queen *Mary*, and their Religion also was established by Parliament, and yet it would have been as sinful and asSchismatical in that Reign to have deserted the Reform'd Bishops and have joined the Popish ones, as it would have been before in the Reign of King *Edward* VI, or was afterward in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, or any Time since: For the Scripture has taught us, (*h*) that we *shall not follow a Multitude to do Evil*: Because though to follow the most numerous Party may be generally a Means to deliver us from the Vengeance of the greatest of Men, if our Offence be only against Man; yet Numbers can never secure us from the Vengeance of God, who can as easily punish many as few.

(h) *Exod.* xxiii. 2.

§ LI. Thus have I endeavoured to state and maintain the Independency of the Church and her Pastors upon the Civil Magistrate, as to its pure Spiritual Powers. And because the chief Objection against this Independency seemed to be drawn from a mistaken Notion, that our Church acknowledged the Sovereign of this Realm, whether King or Queen, for its supreme Head, I thought proper to shew, that though there was once an Act of Parliament which did give our Kings that Title, yet it was soon thought convenient to lay it aside, and that Queen *Elizabeth*, who was as jealous of her Prerogative as any Prince whatsoever, did not only think improper to reassume it, but did also expressly *declare, that it could not be given to any mortal Man*; and therefore, that from her Time, when the Reformation was fully settled, down to these Days, that Title has not been any Part of the Regal Stile of the Princes of this Realm, consequently that we are under no legal Obligation whatsoever to own or acknowledge any such Title to belong to them. I also thought convenient to shew, that as she disowned the Title, so she also disowned all Claim to any Spiritual Authority when she confirmed the xxxix Articles of the Church, wherein it was declared, that our Princes only claimed a Power to restrain, with the *Civil Sword*, the stubborn and evil Doers. Consequently whatever Penalties the Civil Magistrate does or can inflict, are only of a Civil Nature, and therefore can dissolve only such Relations and Obligations as are Civil and Temporal. From whence it follows, that when the Civil Power deprives or dispossesses a Man of his Bishoprick, it can only deprive him of those Temporal Rights which have been annexed to it by the Bounty of our Kings and Princes, such as his Seat in the House of Peers, the Title of Lord, and the actual Possession of the Lands and Revenues belonging to the

the See, becauſe they are ſubject to the outward Force of the Temporal Power, which he muſt not forcibly reſiſt. But as to the Spiritual Relation which he has to that Flock over which he preſides as their Paſtor; as that was not given him by the Temporal Power, ſo neither can the Civil Power take it away and give it to another. His Spiritual Relation to his People ſtill remains the ſame it was; and if they forſake him to receive another Paſtor, they are guilty of the Spiritual Crime of Schiſm, which is the Breach of Charity, and makes all Miniſtrations of the Word and Sacraments ineffectual and unoperative till that Breach is healed. This neceſſarily brought me into a Diſcourſe of *Schiſm*, and obliged me to ſhew, from the Scriptures and the Practice of the Primitive Church to the Time of the Council of *Nice*, that the Primitive Biſhops always looked upon thoſe as Schiſmaticks, who ſet up other Biſhops in Oppoſition to thoſe who were before rightfully poſſeſs'd of their Biſhopricks, and had not fallen from them by Tranſgreſſion, of which Tranſgreſſion the Synod or College of Neighbouring Biſhops were, by our Saviour himſelf, made the proper and only Judges. And that all Biſhops or others who ſet up ſuch intruding Biſhops, and adhered to, or communicated with them, were looked upon as Schiſmaticks: And that it did not matter though the Majority or greater Number made this Defection, tho' they had got Poſſeſſion of all the publick Churches and of all the Revenues belonging to the Church, and were ſupported and protected by the Emperors, the Schiſm was always judged to be made by them who ſet up the other, or intruding Biſhops, in Oppoſition to thoſe who were firſt legally poſſeſt, although they taught no new Doctrine nor made any Alteration in the Offices of the Church, as we have ſeen in the Caſe of the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*. And indeed it muſt be ſo if the Church be independent

on the State as to its pure Spiritual Powers, as I think I have proved it to be, and as it is so plainly acknowledged to be in our Articles, which have been solemnly confirmed by all the Authority in this Realm, both Spiritual and Temporal.

§ LII. Now the Design of these Papers, as I declared at the Beginning, being to perswade the Governors of our Church, if possible, to bring our otherwise excellent Reformation nearer to the Primitive Standard than it yet is, and to supply those Deficiencies which seem yet wanting to make her exactly conformable to the Times of the Council of *Nice*, (when there was but one Communion of the Catholick Church all the World over; when, as (*i*) the Emperor *Constantine* observ'd, there was but one and the same Faith, Doctrine and Discipline in *Rome*, *Italy*, *Africa*, *Egypt*, *Spain*, and *Britain*, in *Lybia* and all *Græcia*, in the *Asiatick* Diocese, and in *Pontus* and *Cilicia*: In which Council were present Bishops, not only from all these Places, but also from *Phœnicia*, *Arabia* and *Palestine*, and in short from every Province of that prodigious Empire; nay, (k) from *Persia* and *Scythia* also, large Countries beyond the Bounds of the Empire; all which Bishops meeting from so many distant Countries, held at that Time the same Faith and the same Communion, (and no Faith or Communion since set up, has ever extended so far:) And the most likely Way to bring this to pass, being to enquire into all those Usages which were then known to be observ'd in the Church agreeably to Scripture, and to restore such of them as we now want: I have first, in order thereto, consider'd the Independency of the Church

(i) Euseb. de vit. Constantin. l. 3. c. 18.
(k) Euseb. de vit. Constantin. l. 3. c. 7.

upon

upon the State, as to its pure Spiritual Powers; which I think I have ſufficiently proved to have been at that Time the known uniform Doctrine of the whole Church: And it is alſo the plain Doctrine of the Church of *England* declared in her Articles. But though we are right as to the Doctrine, yet I know not how it ſeems generally to be miſunderſtood by the People, who having gotten a Notion, that *the King is Supreme Head of the Church*, being told ſo by too many of the Clergy from the Pulpit, fanſie therefore that the King muſt have all Spiritual Power, or all the Power of the Church veſted in him, and that our Biſhops and Clergy derive all their Power to miniſter the Word and Sacraments from him. For which Reaſon I judged it neceſſary to be very particular on this Head, not to rectify any Defect which may ſeem to be in the Doctrine of our Church, which is clear and plain in this Point, but to rectify thoſe Miſtakes which the People, and I wiſh I could not alſo ſay, many of the Clergy likewiſe, have been led into, contrary to the Doctrine of the Church. All therefore I have aimed at in my Diſcourſe on this Head is to rectify this Miſtake, and to deſire the Clergy to inform both themſelves and the People of the true Nature of and Difference between Temporal and Spiritual Power: That the Temporal Power affects the Bodies, Lives and Eſtates, and the Spiritual Power only the Souls of the People: That the Temporal Power alone can judge what Religion ſhall be eſtabliſhed by the Civil Laws: That the Civil Magiſtrate will judge who ſhall poſſeſs the Temporal Revenues annexed to the publick Churches or Edifices erected for publick Worſhip, and who ſhall be permitted to officiate in thoſe Churches, and who not. But that ſuch Temporal Eſtabliſhment makes not a Religion true or falſe: For if it did, then *Popery* would be the true Religion in *France* and *Spain*; *Mahometiſm* would be the true Religion in *Turkey* and in

*Perſia*, and *Heatheniſm* would be ſo in *China* or *Japan*. And therefore though the Magiſtrates Power is irreſiſtible by any Humane Force, when he extends it to all Religions, and to all Caſes of Religion, and takes upon him to judge whether a Man deſerves Fine or Impriſonment, Bonds or Death, even in a Spiritual Cauſe, or in a Spiritual Perſon; yet his Determination in ſuch Matters does not affect the State of Things ſo as to make that wrong which was right, or that right which was wrong. Thus when Queen *Mary* aboliſhed the Reformation in this Realm and ſet up *Popery* in its ſtead, ſhe thereby indeed gave the Popiſh Prieſts and Biſhops the actual Poſſeſſion of the Cathedrals and Pariſh-Churches, and all the Revenues belonging to them: But ſhe could not thereby give them any Right to miniſter the Word and Sacraments to the People, they were as much bound to receive that Word and thoſe Sacraments from the Biſhops and Prieſts of the true reformed Church of *England* during her Reign, as they were in the Reign of her Brother King *Edward* VI, when thoſe Biſhops and Prieſts poſſeſſed the Cathedral and Pariſh-Churches. Neither when Queen *Elizabeth* deprived or diſpoſſeſſed the Popiſh Biſhops, and reſtored the Biſhops and Prieſts of the reformed Church of *England* to the Poſſeſſion of the Cathedral and Pariſh Churches, and the Revenues annexed to them, did that give them any new Spiritual Power which they had not before? it only enabled them to diſcharge their Duties to the People more comfortably. The Spiritual Relation betwixt them and their People was the ſame in the Reign of Queen *Mary* when they were ejected, that it was in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth* when they were reſtored. It is true, in Queen *Mary*'s Reign they were forced to fly into Foreign Parts, or hide themſelves at home, and ſo could not actually attend their Flocks, as when they were protected by the State:

But

But this by no means diſſolved the Relation betwixt them and their Flocks; and ſuch of their Flocks as kept ſteady to them, and refuſed to join with the Schiſmatical Popiſh Prieſt, thereby teſtifying their firm Adherence to the Rightful Reformed Communion, though they could not actually partake of the Word and Sacraments, by reaſon of the Violence and Force both Paſtors and People then lay under, yet were, no doubt, accepted by God as if they had received them: (*l*) even as thoſe ſeven thouſand in *Iſrael* were accepted by God, becauſe they had not bowed the Knee to *Baal*, although they could not go to Worſhip at *Jeruſalem*, there to offer their Sacrifices, which anſwer'd to our Sacraments; or receive that Bleſſing (*m*) which God had given his Prieſts Commandment to pronounce unto his People, and upon the Pronunciation of which, by his Prieſts, he promiſed his Bleſſing. Sacraments are poſitive Inſtitutions appointed by God as Means of our Salvation; but then they are to be received duly and regularly, not Schiſmatically: And therefore we had better not receive them at all than irregularly and in Schiſm; and if God puts us into ſuch Circumſtances that we can receive them no otherwiſe than in Schiſm, it ſhall not be imputed as a Crime if we receive them not; but to receive in Schiſm is ſuch a Crime as makes all our good Actions nothing worth. Thus we find, that, when God permitted any of his choſen People, the *Jews*, to be led Captive, or placed in any ſuch Circumſtances as hindred them from going to Worſhip at *Jeruſalem*, he nevertheleſs vouchſafed them his particular Grace and Favour, as he did to *Daniel* and his three Friends, and other good Men in the *Babyloniſh* Captivity: But when Men, becauſe they could

(l) 1 *King.* xix. 18. (m) *Num.* vi. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.

not go to *Jeruſalem* and receive a Bleſſing from the regular Prieſts of the Houſe of *Aaron*, would carry their Offerings to *Dan* or *Bethel*, that they might receive a Bleſſing from *Jeroboam*'s Prieſts; God was ſo far from accepting them as he did the Children of the Captivity, who were content to wait with Patience for their Reſtoration to the true Worſhip, and would rather omit thoſe poſitive Inſtitutions than practice them irregularly, that this irregular, Schiſmatical Worſhip provoked God to caſt them out of his Sight. (*n*) *Now all theſe Things happened unto them for Enſamples; And they are written for our Admonition*: That we may learn to avoid *Schiſmatical Communion*, and to know, that when God has put us into ſuch Circumſtances as we cannot worſhip him publickly according to his Will, nor aſſemble together under the Conduct of his Regular and Rightful Prieſts, he will accept us rather if we live without Publick Worſhip, than if we aſſemble for ſuch Worſhip in an irregular Schiſmatical Way. In ſuch Caſes we muſt do the beſt we can, we muſt aſſemble as long and as often as we can under our regular Prieſts, and when we are entirely barred even from that, we muſt be content to wait with Patience till God ſhall ſee fit to reſtore us to the Exerciſe of our Worſhip in the true Communion, even as the *Jews* waited ſeventy Years in their Captivity; during which Time God accepted their private Worſhip and vouchſafed his Gifts and Graces to them, not imputing the Want of Publick Worſhip to them as a Crime: For they wanted it only becauſe it was then impoſſible to have it in God's Way. And this was plainly the Caſe of the reformed Church of *England* in the Reign of Queen *Mary*. The Miniſters of the Reformed

(n) 1 *Cor.* x. 11.

Church

Church of *England* assembled privately where they could, and used their own Liturgy which was compiled in the Reign of King *Edward* VI. and where they could not do that, they contented themselves with their own private Prayers, till it pleased God to restore to them the publick Exercise of their Religion. But those who complied in Queen *Mary*'s Reign, and because they could not have the Word and Sacraments from the Rightful Reformed Bishops and Priests of the Church of *England*, chose rather, than go without them, to receive them from the Popish, Heretical, Schismatical Priests then possessed of the Churches, cannot be justified for so doing. For it was not the two contrary Laws of Queen *Mary* and Queen *Elizabeth*, by which the Popish and the Reformed Bishops were, in their Turns, set up and put down, that made the one Right and the other Wrong, but it was their being of the Right or Wrong Communion that laid an Obligation on the Consciences of the People to adhere to them or not. Though our Kings, with their Parliaments, have it in their actual Power to dispose of Lives and Estates, and all Temporalties as they please, and upon what Occasions, or in what Causes they please, whether Temporal or Spiritual, and are accountable to God only for their Actions; yet they cannot alter the Nature of Things, and make that Right which is Wrong, or Wrong which is Right. They can (though it would be the highest Wickedness if they should) make a Law to abolish *Christianity* and set up *Mahometism*, if they think fit; for they have no Superior on Earth to forbid the making such a Law; they can, as Queen *Mary* and her Parliament did, abolish the Reformed Church of *England* and establish *Popery*, but such Acts will not make *Mahometism* or *Popery* the true Religion. A Popish Bishop or Priest, though, by virtue of such an Act, he may get the Revenues of

of a Church, and the Edifice or Church itself into his Possession, yet will have no Right to the Spiritual Obedience of the People, nor can they lawfully receive the Word and Sacraments at his Hands. The Church was instituted by Christ, and was settled by him and his Apostles without the Leave of the Civil Magistrate, or asking any Licence from him. It continued 300 Years to exercise its Spiritual Power and Authority even in Opposition to him, and notwithstanding all his Edicts against it. It was so long, as is allowed on all Hands, independent upon him, and was constituted to be so by *Christ* himself, and I have never read that he has, in any Age since, declared that it ought to be dependent, and I am sure a less Authority than his cannot make it so. He is sole Head of the Church, and sent his Apostles and their Successors as the Father sent him, thereby plainly committing or delegating his Power to rule and govern the Church to them as his Deputies. Hence the Spiritual Power of Bishops and Priests is plainly derived. And when it can be shewed, that *Christ* has, in this or any Manner, delegated a like Power to Princes, I shall then readily acknowledge that they have a Spiritual Power also; but till I see such a Proof, I must think that those, to whom *Christ* committed that Power at first independent on all the Princes of the World, must have it still independent upon them also.

§ LIII. Neither are the Clergy to be accused of Pride and Ambition for claiming such an Independent Power; for if their Commission is from *Christ* independent on the Civil Magistrate, as I conceive I have proved it to be, then is it not Pride or Ambition, but a Duty in them to maintain and assert it to be so: For every Commission is a Trust, and therefore not to assert and maintain it when it is questioned, is to betray a Trust. Whoever gives an Office

Office to any Man, commits to his Truſt all Matters appertaining to that Office: And he that undertakes the Office obliges himſelf to diſcharge the Truſt. But if his Commiſſion be queſtioned, he cannot diſcharge his Truſt without aſſerting and maintaining his Commiſſion; and if he does not do it, he betrays and renounces the Authority of him from whom he received it. Whenever therefore the Biſhops and Paſtors of the Church of *Chriſt* find that Commiſſion they have received from *Chriſt* to be called in Queſtion, whenever they find their Authority to preach the Word and adminiſter the Sacraments, as the Miniſters of Chriſt, to be denied, when Biſhops legally ſet over a Flock, according to the Inſtitution of *Jeſus Chriſt*, are forbidden to take any further Care of that Flock; and others pretend a better Right to it than themſelves: It is not Pride and Ambition in them to inſiſt upon their Right, and to declare, that having received their Authority from *Chriſt*, they cannot be diveſted of it but according to his Laws, and thoſe Rules he left with his Church for that Purpoſe; and not to inſiſt upon their Right in ſuch a Caſe is to betray their Truſt; and it is not barely to give up their own Authority, but the Authority of *Chriſt*, when any other Power than his or one derived from him ſhall pretend to vacate his Commiſſion. This was S. *Paul*'s Caſe, when his Apoſtleſhip and Right over the Church of *Corinth* was queſtioned; he thought it then neceſſary to aſſert his Authority and maintain his Right, as I have largely ſhewed; and (*o*) to let them know, that, though he was not one of the Twelve which our Lord choſe in his Life-time here on Earth, yet *he was not a whit behind the very chiefeſt Apoſtles*. And this he did and ſaid by the Inſpiration of the *Holy Ghoſt*, (*p*) the Author of all Scripture.

(*o*) 2 *Cor.* xi. 5. (*p*) 2 *Tim.* iii. 16. 2 *Pet.* i. 20, 21.

The

The Holy-Ghoſt therefore having authorized and obliged us to maintain and aſſert the Authority of our Commiſſion, and not to yield it up whenever it is queſtioned or denied, it is no Pride and Ambition in us to do ſo, but our Duty; and if we do not do it we have juſt Reaſon to fear the Vengeance of God for cowardly betraying that Truſt he has committed to us. And if Men will nevertheleſs call us proud and ambitious on this Account, that Accuſation is no other than a malicious Calumny and Reproach, ſuch as the faithful Servants of *Chriſt*, and eſpecially his Miniſters, muſt be content to bear; but they muſt not therefore, for fear of ſuch Slanderous Accuſations, tamely give up their Truſt and deſert their Flocks, becauſe they may be called Names for challenging a Right over them as derived from *Chriſt*; whereas the Scripture plainly teaches us, that when a Flock has been regularly committed to any Perſons by Apoſtolical or Epiſcopal Hands, it is not Man, but God (*q*) *the Holy Ghoſt that makes them Overſeers of that Flock.* For theſe Elders of *Epheſus*, to whom S. *Paul* ſaid theſe Words, were not immediately called by *Chriſt* to that Office as the Twelve Apoſtles were, or by any immediate Call by a Voice from Heaven, as S. *Paul* himſelf, or by any other miraculous Means, but had been only appointed to that Office by S. *Paul*, or ſome other of the Apoſtles, (*r*) whoſe Practice it was to *ordain Elders in every Church.* And yet S. *Paul* ſcruples not to ſay, that it was the *Holy-Ghoſt which had made them Overſeers of the Flock.* Becauſe the Holy Ghoſt had directed the Apoſtles to ordain Elders and Presbyters in that Manner: And therefore the appointing Men to that Office by an Apoſtle or Biſhop being not an humane Inſtitution taken up by the Apoſtles upon meer pru-

(q) *Act.* xx. 28. (r) *Act.* xiv. 23.

dential

dential Reaſons, but by Divine Directions and Authority, the Office and Commiſſion is truly ſaid to be from the Holy-Ghoſt, though conferred by the Miniſtry of Men. Conſequently it is no Pride or Ambition to ſay, That the Offices of Biſhops and Preſbyters, and their Right to feed ſuch Flocks, as by Apoſtolical or Epiſcopal Hands are committed to them, is derived from God, and therefore not to be taken from them in any other Way than ſuch as he has authorized in his Holy Word. If Pride and Ambition is to be charged upon any Clergy, it is moſt juſtly chargeable upon thoſe who affect to get into the higheſt Stations of the Church by flattering the Civil Powers, and endeavouring to make them and the World believe, that all Power, Spiritual as well as Temporal, is derived only from them, that ſo by their Help and Aſſiſtance they may at leaſt get the Temporal Poſſeſſions and Honours which, by the Bounty of Pious and Religious Princes have been ſettled on the Church. The Office of a Biſhop or Prieſt, though it carry a Divine Authority with it, is an Office of Labour; and therefore S. *Paul* ſays, (s) *He that deſireth the Office of a Biſhop, deſireth a good Work.* He then that deſireth the Work, is not according to S. *Paul*'s Teſtimony, proud and ambitious. But he, that by indirect Means, ſuch as giving up to Temporal Princes, all that Power which *Chriſt* veſted in his Apoſtles and their Succeſſors the Biſhops, ſeeks to advance himſelf, cannot be excuſed from Pride and Ambition.

---

(s) 1 *Tim.* iii. 1.

*F I N I S.*

## *BOOKS Printed for* HENRY CLEMENTS, *at the* Half-Moon *in St.* Paul's *Church-Yard.*

*Lay-Baptism Invalid:* An Essay to prove, that Baptism is Null and Void, when administred in Opposition to the Divine Right of the Apostolick Succession: Occasion'd chiefly by the Anti-Episcopal Usurpations of our *English* Dissenting Teachers. The 3d Edition.

*Sacerdotal Powers:* Or, The Necessity of Confession, Penance, and Absolution, asserted; in an Essay, occasion'd by Two Sermons preach'd at *Salisbury, Nov.* the 5th, and the 7th, 1710. The 2d Edition.

A Letter to the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid. By *Tho. Brett*, D. D. which may serve as an Appendix to Sacerdotal Powers.

*Dissenters and other Unauthoriz'd Baptisms Null and Void:* In Answer to a Pamphlet call'd, The Judgment of the Church of *England* in the Case of Lay-Baptism, and of Dissenters Baptism. The 2d Edition.

The Bishop of *Oxford's* Charge consider'd, in reference the Independency of the Church, a proper Sacrifice in the Sacrament, Sacerdotal Absolution, and Valid Baptism.

The Second Part of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*: Shewing, that the Ancient Catholick Church never had any Law, Tradition or Custom, for the Validity of Lay-Baptisms; prov'd from Mr. *Bingham*'s Scholastical History, and other Evidences not produced by that Historian.

A Supplement to the First and Second Parts of *Lay-Baptism Invalid:* In Answer to the Second Part of Mr. *Bingham*'s Scholastical History.

All these written by the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

---

The Judgment of the Reform'd in *France*; as also that of Mr. *Calvin*, and other *Genevans*, concerning Lay-Baptism. Collected by a Priest of the Church of *England*, and Rector of a Church in the City of *London.* In a Letter to the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid. Price 4 *d.* Proper to be bound up with the other Pieces, which make Two large Volumes in 8*vo.* price 12 *s.*

The

The Genuine Works of St. *Cyprian*, Archbiſhop of *Carthage*, and Primate of all *Africa*: who ſuffered Martyrdom for the Chriſtian Faith, in the Year of our Lord 258. together with his Life, Writtten by his own Deacon, *Pontius*. All done into *Engliſh* from the *Oxford* Edition; and illuſtrated with divers Notes. To which is added, A Diſſertation upon the Caſe of Heretical and Schiſmatical Baptiſms at the Cloſe of the Famous Council of *Carthage*, held in the Year of our Lord 256. Whoſe Acts are alſo herewith publiſhed. By *Nath. Marſhal*, L. L. B. Rector of the united Pariſhes of St. *Vedaſt*, and St. *Michael le Quern London*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majeſty.

The Life of the Reverend and Learned Mr. *John Sage*, Author of the Principles of the *Cyprianick* Age. Wherein alſo ſome Account is given of his Writings, both Printed and in Manuſcript. Price 1 *s.*

An Eſſay upon Two *Arabick* Manuſcripts of the *Bodleian* Library; and that ancient Book, called, *The Doctrine of the Apoſtles*, which is ſaid to be extant in them: Wherein Mr. *Whiſton*'s Miſtakes about both, are plainly prov'd. The Second Edition. Price 1 *s.*

Some Inſtances of the Defects and Omiſſions in Mr. *Whiſton*'s Collection of Teſtimonies from the Scriptures and Fathers, againſt the true Deity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; and of miſapplying and miſinterpreting divers of 'em.

Both theſe by Dr. *Grabe*.

To the laſt of which is prefix'd, a Diſcourſe giving ſome Account of the Learned Author, and his Manuſcripts. By *George Hickes*, D. D. Price 1 *s.*

*The Judicial Power of the Church aſſerted:* In a Sermon preach'd at a Viſitation in the Archdeaconry of *York*. By *James Talbot*, D. D. late Rector of *Spofforth* in *Yorkſhire*.

*Of Original Sin:* A Sermon preach'd before the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, *&c.* at St. *Paul*'s, *Feb.* 22. 1712-13. By *William Delaune*, D. D. Preſident of St. *John Baptiſt* College, *Oxon*. The Second Edition. Price 3 *d.*

The Authority of Chriſtian Princes, and of Biſhops and Paſtors, in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, not Inconſiſtent with the true Nature of Chriſt's Kingdom. A Sermon Preach'd at *Banbury*, *June* 16. 1717. on *John* xviii. 36. Occaſion'd by a Sermon lately Publiſh'd by the Ld. Bp. of *Bangor* on the

ſame

same Subject. By *Benj. Loveling*, M. A. Vicar of *Banbury* in *Oxfordshire*.

*Dissenters Self-Condemn'd*: Being a full Answer to *Delaune's* Plea for the Nonconformists; lately recommended by *Daniel Foe*, Author or the Review. To which is added, the Dissenters Harmony in Principles with the Papists. By *William Robertson*, M. A. late a Dissenting Teacher. Price 2*s*.

*The Mitre and the Crown*; or a real Distinction between them. In a Letter to a Member of Convocation. In Two Parts. Price 10*d*.

The Principles of *Deism* represented, and set in a clear Light. In Two Dialogues between a *Sceptick* and *Deist*. The 1st concerning Christian Revelation; The 2d concerning Natural Religion. The Second Edition. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.

St. *Athanasius's* Four Orations against the *Arians*, and his Oration against the *Gentiles*. Translated from the Original *Greek*, by Mr. *Samuel Parker*. In Two Volumes. To which the Translator has prefix'd Observations for the better Application of St. *Athanasius's* Reasoning: Together with a few Queries recommended to Mr. *Whiston's* Consideration; and a Confutation of his impious Doctrines, in a Table of References from Mr. *Whiston's* Treatises to the Orations aforesaid. Price 9*s*.

*Bibliotheca Biblica*: Being a Commentary upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament, gather'd out of the Writings of Fathers, and Ecclesiastical Historians, and Acts of Councils down to the Year of our Lord 451. being that of the 4th General Council; and Lower as Occasion may require: Comprehending the Proper, Allegorical or Mystick, and Moral Import of the Text, as delivered or illustrated in the writings and Monuments aforesaid, in such a Manner that, to hear, the Sense of several Commentators in the same, the Names only of those that agree with the first in it, are mention'd, to avoid Repetition; and after such Texts as have been made Use of the Antients against any Hercsies, the Denomination of the Hereticks against whom they have been produced, are inserted.

To which are added Introductory Discourses upon the Authors and Authentickness of the Books, the Time of their being Written, *&c.* extracted, for the most Part, out of the best Authors that have writ upon those Subjects. No. 6. for the Year 1717. to be continued Monthly.